A REVISION
OF DOCTOR GEORGE MORLEI'S
IVDGMENT
IN MATTERS OF
RELIGION
OR,
AN ANSWER TO SEVERAL
TREATISES
WRITTEN BY HIM VPON SEVERAL
OCCASIONS CONCERNING THE
CHVRCH OF ROME
AND MOST OF THE
DOCTRINES
CONTROVERTED BETWIXT HER, AND THE
CHVRCH OF ENGLAND.
TO WHICH IS ANNEXT
A TREATISE
OF
PAGAN IDOLATRY
BY. L. W.

Permissu Superiorum 1683.

THE PREFACE.

SEing my Lord of *Winton* is pleaſed to wipe off that odious aſperſion of his being a *Papiſt* [which myght in the late conjuncture haue coſt him his civil, & endangered his natural life] by declaring not only his judgment in matters of Religion; but alſo the grounds, on which it relyes, contained in ſeverall treatiſes, long ſince compounded, but never till now made publick: I preſume he will not be offended, that with the reſpect due to his quality of Peere of the Realme, theſe be reviewed. *Reviewed*, I ſay, for althô *Appellations* lye only to hygher, *Reviſions* are committed to equal, or even inferiour courts.

He proteſts, he is no *Papiſt*: & I think ſo too. I wish it were as eaſy to cleere him of *Calviniſme*: of which he ownes pag. XII. that he hath beene ſuſpected, & to it he ſeemes enclined when he ſays, „ that God by Miracles promoted the Idolatrous worship of the „ Pictures, & Relickes of Saints. This I think in reality is to make God the *Authour of ſin*: Which *Blaſphemy* I do not beleiue the Church of England will owne, thô it be a choice flower in *Calvin's* garden.

He declares his loyalty to the government eſtablisht, & the Royal Family, &c. And I beleiue him in this alſo: nay I judge as favourably of the greateſt part of his rank, & moreover, that they are loyal not only for their *Intereſt*; but for conſcience, & out of a ſenſe of their duty to God, their ſoveraigne, & their country: & that he, & they, will oppoſe, to their Power, *Schiſme* in the *Church* & *Faction* in the *State*. Yet I think all their endeavours will

be ineffectual to prevent ether, considering the constitution of the *Protestant Church*, & qualifications of its *Clergy*. For as in some natural Bodyes there is a defect, which maugre all care of Physitians, cuts the thred of life, before it be spun to its ordinary length; so in some *Bodyes Politick*, that of the *English Protestant Church*, in particular. Here are some reasons to proue this.

2. The first. *Protestancy* is a *Schisme*, & those who liue in it, liue in a *Schisme*. It is a *Schisme*, because it is a party separated from the whole *Catholick Church*. *Luther* was a *Schismatick*, so was *Calvin*, so was *Zuinglius*, so was each Patriark of your Reformation: for each of these at their first breaking forth, left the *Whole Catholick Church*, or Congregation of *Christians*, of what denomination soever, not any one single Person in the whole world, to whome he (or they) did joine himself. So that if ever any man was truly Schismatick, each one of these was such. Wherefore all who joined to them, as all *Protestants* did, were *Schismaticks*. Now it is not probable that God will giue that greate Blessing of Ecclesiasticall Peace, to *Schismaticks*, who hate it, & oppose it.

My 2. is: Protestants are *Hereticks*, that is *Choosers* of the points, which they beleiue. For the *Catholick Church* delivered to her children not only, what they beleiue; but also many articles which they reject. Each Protestant takes this complex, examins it, & finding some Articles not to please him, he casts them out of his creede. Hence one rejects the *Real presence*, another *Free will*; A third *Merits*; a fourth the *Possibility of keeping God's Commandments*, &c. Each one culling out what Articles he pleases, & composing of them not a *Catholick*; but a *Protestant Faith*: not a *Faith* of the *Ghospels*; but of this time, & their *Phancyes*. What more evident signes of *Hereticks*? Now if they be such, can we think them fit instruments to oppose *Heresy*, who did introduce, & do still defend it? This shall be further confirmed, by my fifth Reason.

My 3. Protestants are a *Cadmean* broode, they sprung out of the Earth armed: & no sooner did their soveraigne Lords see their faces, but they felt their Jron hands. Witnesse *Germany*, *France*, *Hungary*, *Bohemia*, *Scotland*, *Swethland*, *Denmark*, the *Low countryes*, & *Geneva*

& *Geneva*. Our *English Protestants* say, they are not concerned in these Rebellions: but that is not tru, for by approving, & applauding them, they make them their owne, & encourage the Practice, by commending the precedent. With what force can they teach Obedience to his Majesty, who praise Rebellion against other? Or divert men from Treason, who transforme Traitors into Heroes, & canonize Regicides?

My 4. There nether is, nor ever was any Authority vnder the Heavens better grounded than that of the *Catholick Clergy* consisting of the *Pope*, & *Bishops*, was before the Reformation. It was establisht by *Christ*, setled by the *Apostles*, ratifyed by general, & particular *Councils*, confirmed by an vninterrupted Possession of almost fifteene hundred yeares, backt by all Laws Ecclesiastical, & Civil, & acknowledged by all Christians then aliue. What gentleman can say so much for his estate? What officer, for his Authority? What King, for his crowne? What Parson for his Tith? What Protestant Bishop for his miter? When a *Calvin*, a *Luther*, &c to say no more, private men, starte vp, declame against that Clergy, as a humane invention & an Antichristian establishment; & you applaude them, & with them trample vnder feete, the whole sacred Order, & teach your followers, no submission, no obedience is due to it. When you haue taught them to breake such cables, can you expect to bind them to their duty with single threds?

The English Protestant pretence to Bishops doth no satisfy, 1. Because in reality they had no canonical ordination, as we say, & proue. 2. Althô they had imposition of hands, & were real Bishops [which we deny. See Anti-Haman Chapt. xxxv.] yet *They entred not by the doore; but climed vp some other way*, Iohn X. 1. Were not promoted according to any canonical forme ether ancient, or moderne. Wherefore what can we judge of them, but according to Christ's words, *Loco citato*? 3. Your first Protestants promoted their Religion, & Spreade their noveltyes contrary to all even *English Bishops*, & in contempt of them, first in Henry VIII. his time, Tindale, & others. Secondly in Q. Elizabeths time, when all the Bishops aliue detested your Reformation, & were for that stript of

their

their jurisdiction, deposed from their seates, & confined. What wonder then your followers doe not regard that Crosier, which you haue broken, nor honour the Miter, which they haue seene you trample vnder your feate? Lastly suppose your Bishops wereas validly, & canonically consecrated, as any ever were, can you say, that their Authority is better grounded, than that of all the *Catholick Clergy*? Sure you cannot pretend to better grounds for your Authority, than our Clergy had. As it was than lawfull & laudable to three, or four private men to contradict our whole *Clergy* then in being, why may not some private men amongst you, withstand yours? What reason can you alleadge against a Tub preacher? Some texts of scripture? Canons of Councils? Tradition of the Church? Laws of the Realme? All these stood in favour of our *Clergy* against the first *Reformers*, as, & more, evidntly than for you against your dissenters. So your Schisme & Reformation hath deprived you of all meanes to preserue the *Peace* of the *Church*.

My 5. Is taken from the manner of your Reformation. From Rome our Ancesters had received by the same hands a systeme of Faith, a body of Ceremonys, & some Ecclesiastical Laws. The whole Faith as necessary to be beleived, the Ceremonys as decent to entertaine devotion. The laws as convenient to government, & order. And your first Reformers changed all. In Faith they first rejected the whole vnwritten word, Tradition: & a greate part of the written, scripture. They secondly perverted many places of this, by new interpretations, retaining the word without its sense. The Ceremonys, & laws were treated as licentiously, throwing out of dores whatsoever they pleased. Now why may not another imitate these your Patriarks? *Cur non licebit Valentiniano, quod licuit Valentino, de arbitrio suo fidem innovare*? What was lawfull to *Luther*, is sure lawfull to a *Lutheran*: & what was laudable in the sixteenth, is not a sin in the seventeenth age, to giue new interpretations to scripture, abolish other ceremonys, repeale more Canons. Especially the motiues of reforming being common. Which is

My 6. Your first reformers rejected some Articles of Faith, as being delivered by fallible men: some Ceremonys as men's inventions,

tions, & some laws as contrary to Evangelical liberty. Now all this holds as strongly against what they Keepe in, as what they leaue out: for all Canons were imposed by men, all Ceremonys prescribed by men, & scripture it self brought to you, & continued amongst you by fallible men, as much as the real presence. Now as you blot this out of your creede, why may not another strike out Baptisme, a third the Trinity, a fourth the Incarnation, a fifth the vnity of God, a sixth the Deity it self? & so farewell all Faith. What reason is there, to say, that our Roman Missioners sent by S. Gregory were infallible in delivering the mysterys of the Trinity or Incarnation, & fallible, in speaking of Purgatory, or the Real presence? They say they pared away these Articles, because they were not from the beginning & were abuses. But will not a *Monothelit* alleadge the same against the distinction of wills in *Christ*, an *Eutychian*, against the distinction of natures, a *Nestorian*, against the vnity of Person in him, a *Macedonian*, against the Divinity of the Holy ghost, an *Arrian*, against that of the son, a *Manichean*, against the vnity of the Divine nature, a *Iew*, against the new Testament, & a *Libertin*, and *Atheist*, against both old, & new, & God himself? These are not wyre drawne conclusions, by obscure mediums, & far fetched illations; but natural, & obvious sequels of the fundamental principles of your Reformation, which are inconsistent with any constancy in Faith, and settlement in Church government. So I must conclude, that your *Church building is such, as no principles can beare; & your principles are such, as can beare no building*. By which we may guesse, from whome your reformers had their vocation, from *Abaddon*, *Apollion*, the *Destroyer*, seing their principles are good only to *Destroy Churchs*; not at all to *Build* them.

In fine, a prudent man, without casting a figure, might haue seene the fate of the late troubles, in their principles, which were inconsistent with any setled forme of civil gouvernment & would ruin them all successively; as they did, without any hopes of rest, vnlesse these were layd aside, & the just, & ancient government restored. The like conjecture may be made of *Protestantisme*, its principles

principles being inconsistent with any setled forme of Faith, & Church government, will destroy them all by Schisme & Heresyes, & no probability of a settlement vnlesse these be renounced, & the Ancient, Catholick, & Apostolical Faith, & Government restored. For a further proofe of this, I appeale to experience, (which is a demonstration *A posteriori*, as the former is *A priori*) which is

My 7. Experience shews, that tis much easier to destroy, than to settle a government ether in *Church*, or *State*. Nothing of Art, or Power was wanting to the establishment of the *Prelatical Church* in *England*. She appeared first with the plausible colours of an Apostolical Reformation, was cherisht by Royal favour, armed the severest laws imaginable. Yet one age had not past over her head, when the peccant humours bread within her, layd her in the dust, & the crowne it self with her, which it was hoped, she would vp hold. Both were againe restored: yet how soone was the joy of that over, & both brought againe into a like danger? Seeke no where abroade the spring of these mischeifes, they rise from the Reformation, & are inseparable from the Protestant Church.

My 8. And last reason is drawne from the Protestant Clergy, it self, which as it is modelled, & principled, can never sufficiently influence the Nation to preserue its vnion in the Worship of God, & its duty to the King: to prevent *Schisme* in the *Church*, & *Faction* in the *State*. This appeares by experience. The reasons I reserue till some further occasion be given.

3. D. M. (so we shall hereafter call my Lord of Winton) says in his Preface pag. 11. *A french Iesuit called Mainbourg publisht something as written by her late R. H.* & he repeates afterwards four times in the Preface & once in his post script *Mainbourg the Iesuit*: when it was *Mainbourg the secular Preist* who printed it. Which that booke of his tells all the world, so did the publike Gazets, containing his dismission out of the Society. His superiors did never permit him to print it, whilest he was a *Iesuit*, knowing how sacred the secrets of Princes ought to be. So that paper crept about only in written copyes, seene by few, & of these not many beleiving it to be hers, whose name it beares. Now D. M. hath spreade it, & the

the rumor of her Change in Religion, for his owne vindication, & so prejudiced his mother the Church of England: for I doubt not but her R. H. example will moue more Powerfully to leaue that Church, than D. M. S. judgment, to retaine men in it.

He questions the Conference betwixt her R. H. & the Bishop: which being a matter of Fact, must rely on the deposition of witnesses, & their credit, & interest. She is positiue, he conjectural: she had no motiue, but Truth; he concerned for the honour of his Church, & his owne. His topick is, if the Bishop answered so, he was nether so *Learned*, nor *Conscientious*, nor *Prudent*, as he ought to be. Which many will easier grant, then that her R. H. in a matter of fact would wittingly tell an vntruth.

He relates many things in his Preface to little purpose. v. c. His coming out of *England* with 130. l. & returning with as much, (as if he had the blessing of the *Israelits*, in the desert whose cloths did not weare out) his serving his Majesty, & the Q. of *Bohemia*, without putting them to any charge, but his diet, his catechising their servants, & preaching to them, his journy to *Collen*, & returne to the Hague: &c. what is the publick concerned in all this? Vnlesse it be to helpe an Hystorian to write his life. But of heroical men even the Cradles, Rattles, & Hobby horses are venerable.

Pag. viii. He says, he did not convene with the french *Hugonots*, because if *They did not encourage, yet they did not, at least had not, condemned the rebellious proceedings of their Presbiterian brethren in England against the K. & Church.* Which implyes only their being idle spectators of that Tragedy, in which many think they were Actors for the worse side: & many English women in *Geneva* who followed their husbands thither at the end of the wars, were proofe enough. I will relate here what I find in Grotius his *Discussio Rivetiani Apostolici* pag. 88. & 89. where having sayd, that the publick Peace is disturbed by that Doctrine: *Licita esse pro Religione subditorum in Reges arma*, he adds: *Hoc vir nobilissimus Plessiacus Mornæus, tanquam pietati consentaneum, testamento etiam suo inseruit. Hinc ille motus Ambaxianus, cum Reformatus Renauderius quosdam sui similes in privatum conclave convocasset, & dedisset eis potestatem Ordinum Regni. Hinc*

Beza

Bezæ conciones pro classico. Hinc Rupellensis Conventus impudentis; qui omnes in Regno Pontificios, deinde etiam Reformatos, Regis auctoritatem sequentes, declaravit ab honoribus omnibus, muneribusque publicis dimovendos: præfecturas autem per omne Regnum distribuit, quibus voluit; talium consiliorum auctorem sibi fuisse PETRVM MOLINEVM testatur Theophilus Mileterius, vir nobilis, & illis, qui reformatos se dicunt, optimè volens. Thus he. This booke hath beene printed neere these forty yeares: & never any thing alleadged against these matters of fact, that I could heare of. How will *Monsieur du Moulin Prebend of Canterbury* reconcile with this Counsil of his Father, that letter, which he printed in his fathers name?

4. These treatises, having beene composed on emergent occasions, without any setled designe, haue no other order than that of the time, they were composed in, amongst those of the same language. I designed once to draw the matters handled in them, into some method, which would helpe to their vnderstanding. But because that would make my Answer to D. M. lesse satisfactory (a thing mainly aimed at) I tooke the easier way, to follow my Authour, as he leades me, step by step, without omitting any thing material. I omit in my Revision the letters of the Regular Preist, as not grounding the judgment, in matters of Religion, of D. M. as also D. M. his letter to *Trigland*, as containing nothing to our purpose. For it treates only two points: the 1. of *Fact*, that his majesty really was a Protestant. To which no answer is necessary. The second of *Policy*, that his Majesty was to be restored to his Crowne by an Army of the states. To this I cannot answer, as never having commenced Batchelour in Policy. Yet I will say, that God himself found a way to restore his Majesty & put an end to the troubles of the *State*, without Armes (contrary to the expectation of D. M.) And I hope [at least it long hath beene, is, & shall be my constant Prayer] that the *God of Peace* put an end to these contentious disputes in the *Church*; that we all may come to compose but *One sheepefold*, vnder *One shepherd*. John X. 16. I thought once to omit his letter against F. *Cressey*, as being cheifly personal: yet finding besides a too severe charg on him, some Reflections vpon his

his whole holy Order, I tooke leaue to review the grounds of both, yet past it lyghtly, as entring vpon it vnwillingly.

That the Reader may with lesse trouble see what the Doctor says, & to what J answer, I giue his owne words, commonly at large, at least their full sense: & J marke the page, where they are to be found. This makes my Revision somewhat longer: but that is compensated with the ease of discovering the *Truth*, which both sides pretend to, but only one side contends for sincerely, the other opposes with all his Power. God grant to all a sincere loue of *Peace*, & *Church vnion*: & then all these disputes will cease.

Post script. What is contained in my fourth Booke, pag. 111. that *Factious men* were *proficients in the Art of promoting mischeife*, was written in march last, 1683. I little dreamed to see my conjecture confirmed so soone in such a notorious manner, as it was by *The Rye Plot*, & *Blunderbusses*. God hath miraculously both disappointed, & discovered those Ruffians: J beseech him, to grant, that the Roote, [at least the pretext, or occasion] of all these traiterous Practices, *The hatred of jnnocent men, & loyal subjects, may cease.*

SOME FAVLTS TO BE CORRECTED

Pag. 15. line 23. received. Read, revived.
Pag. 28. line 26. againe. Read, against.
Pag. 44. line 3. it. Read, him.
Pag. 86. line 28. Et. Read, And.

THE FIRST BOOK.

A REVISION

OF THE CONFERENCE BETWIXT *D. MORLEY* AND F. DARCY, AT BRVSSELS.

THE PREFACE.

THE first Treatise, which occurr's in this collection, is *the sum of a short Conference with a Iesuit at* Brussels. I leaue others to judg, whether it be an *Historical*, or a *Poetical narration*, or, whether it contains only sincerely what was; or what might be, as not thinking it worth the while to enquire, especially when we consider, that certainly the greatest part, & possibly, all those present who could inform vs, are dead. Those who haue been acquainted with *F. Darcy*, & know his great abilityes in controversy, & consider how weakly he is made to answer, are apt to guess, that our Authour, Poet-like brings him, & others, on the stage as he pleases, & there makes him speak, what is easiest to be confuted. I rather incline to the contrary, that really there was such a Dispute & such things, in substance alleadged *pro*, & *con*. Yet I must beg leaue to say, that I beleiue the *Doctor* did not subtract any strength, from his own, nor ad any, to *F: Darcy's* discourse; it being but ordinary that things are so disposed, in such relations, as the *Knight* may kill the *Gyant*. Hence I regard little what that *Father* is reported to haue sayd; but attend chefly if not only, to what the Doctor alleadges against the *Church*, which I will defend to my power. We shall find his [D. Morley's] cheife

Argument drawn from the *Communion of Infants*, by which he endeauours to proue, that the Church can erre, seing it hath erred which Vicount *Falkland* brought against the credit of our *Traditions*. Which hath been already answeared, thô this is not taken notice of. But let vs hear the Doctor speak.

SECTION I.

1. *The English Iesuits Ciuilitys to their country men.* 2. *Their manner of liuing. Which the Doctor approues of & highly commends.*

D. Morley. *The Lord Viscount* Neubourg . . . *&* D. Morley *coming to the* Iesuits Colledg, . . . *found Father* Darcy *with the Lord* Andover. 1. *He received them very courteously, & to satisfy their curiositys, . . . very frankly made vs* 2. *a larg narratiue of their manner of liuing, lodging, diet, together with the hours of Rising, studying, eating, & recreations, & of all the spiritual hours, & exercises, they were bound vnto.* 3. *Things all of them in their seueral kinds, for the substance of them very commendable, & worthy the imitation.*

Revisor. I easily beleiue, that *F. Darcy* very wel deserved this publick testimony of his kindness, 1. because he is known to haue been very ciuil to all men. 2. Because I am informed that it always was, & still is the custome of the *English Iesuits*, to receiue courteously, & do all good offices for their country men, in all places, where they meet them: & this not only to persons learned, or noble, whose qualitys, or qualifications may claim it as due; but also to others on no score distinguishable from the meanest: which all those can testify, who by design, or chance, pass by their Colledges. And their kindness to their countrymen in distress, hath not been like that of those who Iames 2. 15. 16. *Seing their brother, or sister*

ter naked, and destitute of dayly food, say vnto them, depart in Peace, be you warmed & filled. But they haue giuen them those things, which are needfull to the Body. I will not mention any, whose names, & necessitys are scarce known, but in their neighbourhood. Was *Bedlow* a Prisoner in Spain at *Valladolid*? the *Iesuits* there labour to procure his liberty. Was *Dangerfeild* condemned to be hanged in the *Low-countryes*? The *Iesuites* leaue no stone vnmoued to saue his life. Was *Oates* in want of all things necessary for food, & rayment? He finds the *Iesuits* purse open, & hand stretcht forth to his releife: this he hath found in *England*, *Spain*, & *Flanders*, as long, as there was any hopes of his amendment. And althô very often this *Iesuitical kindness* meetes with a *Tru-Protestant gratitude*, yet they continu still the like good offices: so these proceed not from the compassion of some tender harted *Iesuits*; but from the spirit of their order, which they suck in with the milk of *Iesuitisme*, confirm by practice, & cherish with hopes of eternal rewards.

What *Hospitals* haue they not visited, where they heard any of their dearest countrymen lay sick? Into what *Dungeons* haue they not procured entrance, if an English-man were cast into them? what sicknes so loathsom, as to make the *Iesuits* nauseate the sick? or so infectious, as to fright them away? what house for infection so shut vp from commerce with all men, as to exclude the *Iesuits*? And what danger so great, as to deter a *Iesuit* from running into the midd'e of it to releiue an English man in distress? How many of them haue destroyed their health, how many haue lost their liues, in these works of *Mercy*? And how little haue the suruiuing *Iesuits* been deterred from the like workes, by the euils befallen their Brethren, & hanging over them selues? Haue we not seen the famous fable of *Pilades*, & *Orestes* so renowned amongst the *Pagans*, out don by a *Iesuit*, who being indicted by the name of a *Benedictin*, then present, he chose rather to vndergo the sentence of death, than to cleere himself by discovering the mistake, & by that, bringing the tru *Benedictin* into danger? The sentence

was not executed; it is tru: but that doth not diminish the esteem due to the *Iesuits* heroical resolution, to suffer death himself, rather than auoid it, by occasioning any danger to another. He saw death, & an ignominious death according to the world, before his eyes, not to be auoided, but by a *Repricue*, which he had nether meanes to sollicit for, nor hopes to obtain, considering how punctually such sentences had been executed on others, not withstanding all endeavours to get them suspended. So his permitting the *Verdict* to be brought in, & the sentence to pass vpon him, without making vse of so certain, so obuious, so euident a meanes to trauerse it, was to thrust his neck into a halter, only to hinder his neighbour's danger of it. Was not this very litterally the perfectest charity, for one to giue his life for another?

2. Whence proceedes this *Zeal* of souls, this alacrity to encounter any danger, how great soeuer, or difficulty [except that one of offending God by sin] in these pious attempts? Answer: from their education, & the practice of their whole life, from their entry into the *Society*. At their entrance knowing how little it would avail them to gain the whole world, with the loss of their souls, & in imitation of him, who being rich, for their sakes became poor, for his sake they renounce all they haue, & all they hope for in this world. Their first two yeares, or *Nouiceship* is spent in meditating on the life, doctrine, & death of *God* made *Man*, which aimes at nothing else, but the good of souls. And all their other exercises are to confirm them in the contempt of themselues, the loue of god aboue all things, of their neighbour as them selues, & in this *Zeal* of souls. At their entrance into the *Nouitiate*, they are obliged to make for a whole month, the spiritual *Exercices*: in which they consider first for what end, they, & all men were created: *Viz*, to serue god in this world, & enioy him in the next. That all creatures what soeuer, Heauen, & Earth, Beasts, Birdes, & Fishes, are designed as seruants to man, on his way to eternal bliss: that euen those blessed Angels, so much our superiours in nature, are but

but our seruants, being all Heb 1. 14. *Ministring spirits, sent forth to minister for them, Who shall be heires of Saluation.* That all that *God & man, Christ-Iesus*, did, & preacht, & suffred Heb. 5. 7. *In the days of his flesh*, was designed for that same great end, *To saue souls.* Now if god himself, the only competent Judg of the valu of souls, esteemes them so much, how can we set too great a price vpon them? who wil regret any paines taken for their good, who hath before his eyes the trauels, the hunger, & thirst, the preachings, & other labours of the *Son of god*? who wil be abasht at any danger in pursuit of so great a good, who sees with the eyes of Faith Christ crucifyed, shedding the last drop of his bloud, & suffring death, to purchase by it the life of souls? This in the *Exercices.*

After that monthly *Recollection*, & conversation with only god, & his blessed *Saints*, their whole employments are such, as may prepare them for that great work, the greatest of all divine workes, as S. *Denis* says, To cooperate with God in the Conversion of souls. Do they pray? It is to vnite themselues the closer to Almighty God, that so they may be fitter instruments for him to work with, & encrease the Zeal of souls. Do they study? It is to render themselues more capable to assist them. Do they Teach? Do they Preach? It is to direct men to Heauen by declaring to them sauing Truths. Their recreations, eating, drinking, sleeping aim at the same end; for by them they conserue, or repayr their strength, that they may continu to serue god, & their neighbour. Thus all the actions of each day, month, year, & their whole life are employed in procuring the salvation of themselues, & their neighbour.

They rise at Four in the morning, with their harts full of gratitude to god, who hath preserued them that night; & petitions for a blessing on their Actions that day. At four and a halfe they begin their meditation, or mental *Prayer* which lasts for a whole hour, on some passage of the life, or point of doctrine of *Christ.* Then they say or hear *Masse*: which being a Commemoratiue *Sacrifice* of that, on the cross, renews the memory of what god did, & suf-

fred to saue souls: & consequenly renews Zeal to procure it. The rest of the morning is spent either in mental, or vocal Prayer, or study, or dealing with their neighbor, according to the order of *Superiors*, or present occasions. Only one quarter before dinner is assigned for a seuere review of their Actions, of the whole morning, & taking a strict Account of them all, in the presence of god. For what they find well don, they giue thanks to god, the Authour of all good: for what is reprehensible, they ask God pardon, & endeauour to dispose themselues to receiue it, by a true sorrow for hauing offended him, & a strong resolution neuer more to offend him. Dinner is followed with a *Recreation* (as they call it) for an hour, which is spent in discourses of pious things, or others indifferent. The rest of the afternoon till supper is spent as the morning [except *Masse*, & the first hour of Prayer.] After supper one hour is allowed for mutual conversation: then the great *Litanyes* of all *Saints* are sayd by all together, which last about a quarter: a second quarter is assigned to prepare the morning's meditation: a third for the *Examen* of their conscience, & the last to go to bed: which all must do by nine. This is their ordinary distribution of time, for the whole day. Which I hear was exactly observed by the *Iesuits* during their close imprisonment, to the astonishment of their keepers, who could not tell how they could so regularly do all those several pious Actions at the same hours, hauing no communication with one an other: they did not, they could not know, that this was the distribution of time vsed in their *Colleges*.

I need not say, that each one hath a chamber to himself which serues as much for modesty as conuenience: that this is fitted [as that of *Elizeus*, or *Elisha* 4 Reg. c. 10 by the *Sunamite*] with things necessary for vse; without superfluitys: that their diet is frugal, without daintys: & their whole way of liuing is decent, & neate; without ether vanity, which they abhor; or sordidnesse, in the Pouerty, which they profess. In one thing they think they cannot be too prodigal; in their churches, their Altars, their sacred Vessels,

ſels, & veſtments. They know God to be the King of Kings, & Lord of Lords: & adoring him aboue all the world they think it all too little for him. Wherefore whatſoeuer they can procure by themſelues, or by their freinds, they employ freely in the *Diuine ſeruice.* From the ſplendour of their churches, ſome ſtrangers to their manner of liuing, gueſs them to be exceeding rich whereas did they know all, they would correct that errour. At *Bruges* they haue a noble church; & but a pittifull building for their own abood. They are though't to flourish as much in *France*, as in any part of *Europe:* yet a ſtrict ſuruey being made of all their reuenues vnder the French dominions by order of his moſt Chriſtian Majeſty, they were found not to haue two hundred French *Liuers* per annum, *In ſingula Capita.* Whereas ſome other very auſtere & reformed Religious Orders, & who are not noted as rich, haue according to the ſame ſurueyours aboue 1300. liuers, *In ſingula Capita.* Hence is euident, that diſcourſe of *Ieſuits* riches is an effect of malice in ſome, & of ignorance in moſt men.

This J ſay to ſupply that part of the Conference, which you only hint at, by the words aboue cited, that *He*, the Father, *Made a larg narratiue of their manner of liuing, &c.* This *Narratiue*, had you giuen it to the publick, would haue giuen greater ſatisfaction, than mine, becauſe the *Father* had greater experience, than J haue. Howeuer J do not fear to be blamed in the whole, or any part of this relation, ſo great a confidence J haue in thoſe Informations J rely on.

3. Hence I am not much ſurpriſed, to ſee you approue theſe Actions, as *Very commendable, and worthy the Imitation for the ſubſtance of them.* A perſon of ſo quick a wit, & ſo ſolid iudgment, could not haue any other opinion of them. Yet J dare you to ſquare theſe circles, or reconcile theſe contradictions: *the Actions of* Ieſuits *are for the ſubſtance of them commendable.* And *: the Cheife action of* Jeſuits *is not commendable*, viz, the *Maſſe*, which you, & your Brethren hold to be downright *Idolatry.* Now *Maſſe* is not only one of

of the *Iesuits* religious Actions; but it is the very Cheife of them all. For as in the old law all its rites, ceremonys & sacrifices were but figures, or types of the *Sacrifice* of the *Cross* which was designed from the beginning, & which being intentionally present in God's vnderstanding did moue his goodness euer since *Adam's* fall to pardon men's sins & grant them those Blessings, to which, in vertue of that *Sacrifice* they had a right, on which account the true Lamb of God is sayd to be *Occisus ob origine mundi* Apoc. 13. 8. *Sacrificed from the beginning of the world*, so in the new all our deuotions, all our prayers, all our pennances, our interiour, & exteriour vertuous Actions, regard the same sacrifice of the *Cross*, & that of the *Masse*, which is a commemoration, or repetition of that other of the *Cross*. So all our deuotions are only as preparations to it, or Thanks giuings for it, & the graces we receiue by it. Thus in the natural Body all Actions vegetatiue & sensitiue proceed from the head, & hart, & are cheifly designed to nourish, helpe, & defend them: & in the mystical Body, of Religious Actions, & Dutys they all proceed from, & end in the Bloudy Sacrifice of the Cross, & in the vnbloudy sacrifice of the *Mass*, for as much as in them is contained our blessed saviour *CHRIST-IESVS God blessed for euer more*, the A, & Ω, *Beginning & end* of our Religion, in whom all our Devotions concenter, he being the Founder, & Authour of our *Faith*, the Ground, & Anker of our Hope, & the Principle & Object of our *Charity*. *Which three vertues are Cheifly, or rather solely aimed at in Religion. Hæc maximè, imo vero sola in Religione sequenda sunt.* Aug. Enchir. c. 4.

Now if *Mass* the cheifest, & noblest of Religious Actions be *Idolatry*, as you say elsewhere, how do you say now it is *Lawfull*, nay *Commendable*, & *Worthy the imitation*? If it be so, certainly it is not *Idolatry*. But Contradictions are vnavoidable, when we combate a known truth, which by surprisal will force an acknowledgment of it self, altho we arm ourselues against it when advertised. Hence you approue here the same thing in Gross, which you condemn

demn in retail. I leaue you this bone to pick, & proceed.

SECTION II.

1. *Conferences to compose differences in Religion seldome successefull, & why?*
2. *Security of Preists in England, & danger of Ministers at Brussels.*

D. Morley. 1. *My lord* Andover *wisht, that some learned, & moderate men of the Churchs of* Rome, *&* England *might meet & debate freely, & charitably the* Differences *between the two* Churchs, *which are not so many, nor so great, but they might find out some expedient to compose them.* 2. D. Morley *Sayd it would be imprudent, & vnsafe for him to dispute of Religion in* Brussels: *thô the Preists in* England *had often with all boldnesse, freedome, & safety, before many witnesses mantained their opinions. So vpon my life may you do here, sayd F. Darcy,* & be so far from offending me, as I shall take it as a favour.

1. Revisor. Altho I readily grant the capacity of that noble man to be great; yet I must beg leaue to dout, whether he were a competent Judg of the most ready way to end the *Differences* in points of *Faith* betwixt dissenting *Churchs*: this requiring a greater search into points of *Doctrine*, & *interest*, then Persons of his quality, & education are willing commonly to vndergo. *Truth* is ever pretended on both sides; but it is onely pretended on the one side, which in reality applyes all its industry to suppresse it, for ether motives of *Passion*, *Interest*, *Envy*, *Spite*, *Reveng*, & what else is contrary to the law of God. When these possesse the hart, the head is busyed to make Vertu pass for vice, & vice for vertu,

to adorn Falshood with the dress of Truth, & by sophistical reasons make Truth be suspected of Falshood. He will by calumnyes as black as Hell, render odious, or contemptible the persons, who oppose his Passion, & thwart his Interest, Cross his design, & procure his real good, by discovering his errours, & by that inviting him to return to the ancient Faith, & Communion of the *Church*, which he broke through want of *Charity*. It is hard to discover the wiles of those Foxes, & ways of these wolves, the fraudulent, or fierce enemys of the Churchs Peace; to see through that mist which they raise on purpose not to be seen, & to fathom these *Depths of Sathan*. Apoc. 2. 24. Now thô this noble man's capacity was great, yet perchance not sufficient for so obscure, & intricate a work.

Yet when all the doubling of these Foxes are discovered, & the secrets of their harts layd open, yet the work is not half don. The greatest difficulty remaines, to wean them from those beloved wandrings: it being one of the dismallest effects of these sinfull errours, that by secret, yet power full charmes, they fix the will in the loue of them. Hence S. Prosper. Tantum nocet error

Vt juuet errare, & veteris contagia morbi
Tam blande obrepunt, vt quo languetur ametur.
Such charmes before our eyes doth errour lay,
That it e'en makes vs loue to go astray:
Whilst th' evil spreads, we vnconcerned go,
Deceiu'd, & yet contented to be so.

The secretary of nature *Aristotle* never div'd deeper into the hart of man, then when he sayd, that althô Reason seemes to hold the scales, & discern betwixt two contending parts, yet in reality it is the hart, the will, which deliberates, & decides the thing in question. Hence comes that variety of judgments on the same individual Action, of which one shall make a *Panegyrick*, another a *Satyre*. And thô the *lyght* of Truth, & the appearance of God, be so cleer, as not to be concealed, yet this shall be as ineffectual, as to

as to all influence on our Actions, as if they were dreames, a sensual man prefers Pleasure before his Honour; A vertuous man the contrary. So we judg [as we are affected] not as we should: our will doth not follow, but lead nay drag after it our Reason, & that with so sweet a violence, that it is not perceived without much labour, great attention, & strict search into the beginning, progresse, & end of our Actions. This is the root of all incoherent discourses, & illogical deductions of Passion, & interest or self-loue, which in many prevail over Truth, controul the inclinations to good, & make men break all their dutys to God & their country, to Prince, freinds, & Relations: & thô they see what is better, yet do the contrary. *Video meliora proboque Deteriora sequor.*

This difficulty seemes invincible, when strengthned with the content, which Proud Ring'eaders find in having their followers harts at a beck, & being esteemed by them, as *Oracles*: a satisfaction sayd Sr *Francis Bacon* as much aboue that of *Tyrants*, as mens souls are aboue their Bodys. In the whole black list of *Heresiarks* only two occur to my mind, who truly repented, viz., *Eutichius* Patriark of *Constantinople*, who denyed the Resurrection of the Flesh, & was converted by S. *Gregory* our Apostle, & *Berengarius* Patriark of the *Sacramentarians* Only these two to my remembrance dyed well, professing the tru Faith contrary to their several errours. Without doubt some, if not all, other *Heresiarks* were convinc'd of the vntruth of their doctrines, & were as the Apostle says αὐτοκατάκριτοι *Condemned of themselves*, or knowing that they deserved condemnation: & doubtlesse all felt those reproachs of conscience which follows all guilty Actions: yet Pride hardened their harts against all. Now what can work vpon these men in order to their Conversion? set before theyr eyes Truth? they know; but will not acknowledg it. Reproach vnto them their perfidious abandonning God, and his spouse the Church? the Holy Ghost doth it inwardly, & they slyght him. Threaten Hell, & damnation, to terrify them? They are

They are selfcondemned, & yet are vnconcerned, this opposing known Truth, is a sin against the Holy ghost impossible to be forgiven, because it is morally impossible to be repented. This is proved by Reason, confirmed by experience & delivered by the Apostle. Which is to be vnderstood of *Heresiarks*, & such as schoolmen call *Formal Hereticks.*

Yet I know many, & I hope most of those who liue in schism or Heresy *do so*, either by misfortune of their birth, or education, or by weakenesse of reason, or strength of Passion, or fear of punishment, or loue of goods of fortune; rather then hatred to the *Church*, or loue to *Heresy*: & therefore are not *Formal Hereticks*, or *Schismaticks.* Many followed *Absalom* to *Hebron*, without any design against their lawful Monark *David*; althô they were after engaged in the *Rebellion.* And many follow *Heresiarks* intending no evil; but hoping good from such as pretend nothing else [& who would hate these perfectly, if they knew their *Hypocrisy* or *malice*] who are insensibly engaged in the guilt of separation, which they strengthen with their presence. These (nether having the guilt of a sin against the Holy Ghost vpon their Conscience, nor their soulhardned against the Callof God) we hope may be reclaimed: And a *Conference* severally to such, as these, may proue beneficial: Though not to the whole body of *Separatists*, vpon which the more factious heads will always haue too great an influence.

How fruitlesse of old were the *Conferences* of S. *Peter* with *Simon* the magician, of S. *Athanasius* with *Arrius*, of S. *Austin* with *Felix*, with *Pascentianus*, *Felicianus*, *Emeritus*, or the *Arrians*: of *Lanfrancus* with *Berengarius*, of S. *Bernard* with *Peeter Abaylardus*! what good came of the *Conference* of *Catholicks* & *Hugonots* at *Poissy* in *France*? Of those betwixt *Catholicks* & *Lutherans* in *Germany*? And that betwixt *Protestants* & *Presbiterians* at *Hampton-court* brought no good, althô directed by K. Iames, a learned, & wise Prince, to whom both Partys owed Obedience in Ecclesiastical matters, as to one whom both owned to be head of their *Church.*

With

With great reason then *Tertullian* Prescrip. c. 15. 16. 17. advises (out of the Apostles words, to *Avoyd* a *Heretick* after twice warning him) not to meet *Hereticks*, except only to *Warn them*. That much harm may be feared ; but no good hoped for by Disputes with them. That we ought to presse them to declare, whence they had the scriptures. If from Catholicks [as most certainly *Protestants* had] then they must from them also receiue the sense of scriptures. Thus he. Out of which it doth not follow, that *Catholicks* are bound to receiue the sense of scripture from the *Iews*, from whom they received the Holy scriptures, because those same Persons, who brought vs the scriptures from them, & proved their Mission from God, declared the blindnesse & Apostasy of the *Iews*, & warned vs, as from God the Authour of *Scriptures*, to be ware of them.

S Austin 13. cont. Faustum c. 12. is of the same mind, that all such Disputations are fruitless.

Hunnericus King of the wandals proposed a conference betwixt his *Arrian* Bishops, & those of the *Catholick Communion*. But *Eugenius* Bishop of *Carthage* in the name of all the rest rejected the Proposition, saying they could not accept it, without consent of other Bishops, cheïfely of him of *Rome*. *Victor of Vtica* lib. 2. de Persec. wandalicâ.

The Civil Law forbids all disputations L. *Nemo C. de summa Trinitate*. The same are forbidden to seculars, by the Canon law, C. *Quicumque de Hæreticis* in 6.

For some particular reasons, without any prohibition from the Church, by common consent *Catholicks* refused to encounter some *Hereticks*. Such was *Sisinnius*, who because he had a pleasant drolling wit, would seeme victor by turning all discourse into ridicule when he had nothing substantial to reply. S. *Austin* when a *Manichæan* was avoyded for his singular skill in *Logick*. For a like reason (I beleiue) *Christians* were warned by the Apostle [Colos 2. 8.] *To beware of being deceived through Philosophy.*

Yet

Yet we cannot, we dare not vniversally blame those who by *Conferences*, or *Disputes* endeavour to bring back straglers into the way of salvation. For *Christ* disputed with the *Pharisees*. S. *Stephen* with the *Iews* in *Hierusalem*: S, *Paul* & *Apollo* with the same else where: S. *Hilarius* with the *Arrians*. S. *Austin* with the *Donatists*, *Manichæans*, & others. This Saint Epist. 48. Says *Cum Hereticis, verbis agendum est, disputatione pugnandum, ratione vincendum. Treate with Hæreticks with words, fyght them with discourse, overcome them with reason.*

Hence Divines do nether absolutely approue, nor absolutely condemn such *Conferences*; but hold them law full on some conditions, in certain circumstances, which may be found in them.

This honourable man hints at two conditions, 1. that the *Disputants on both sides be learned, & moderate*. 2. That *They proceed freely & charitably*. Which are good; but scarce sufficient. For 1. it is no easy matter amongst those who sincerely haue any Religion, to find such as are *Moderate* in his sense. And 2. even the most *Moderate* men may be so pinioned by instructions, from those who depute them, that their Personal *Moderation* will signify nothing: for they must follow their instructions, vnder pain of being disowned by their party, & left to make good their own Acts. Thus *Melanchthon*, & *Bucerus*, who were esteemed *Moderate*, could effect nothing at the several meetings to which they were deputed.

The same I say of the 2. condition, debating *Freely*, & *Charitably*: which signifyes nothing vnlesse the whole Party 1. giue a full power to its deputyes without any reserue, & oblige it selfe to ratify, & approue what so ever shall be agreed on & consented to by them. And 2. would assuredly stand to that Power. Do we not see, that a separation is first resolved on, & errours sought out & alleadged only to colour it? Did not *Luther* laugh at the labour -- in -- vain of the *Catholicks*, who confuted his errours, saying that before they had dispacht the old ones, he would find them more worke, by broaching new? And how often are the same objections renewed,

after

after a full & satisfactory answer? That, for example, of *Pagan Idolatry*, reproached to vs lately by E. S G. B. & R. C. but answered so home by T. G. & W. E. that it will be layd aside, till these are forgotten: & then we may expect to see some huffing minister thunder all the curses of scripture from the beginning of *Genesis*, to the end of the *Apocalypse* against the *Church of Rome*, as guilty of the very *Pagan Idolatry*? Thus *Trita hæreticorum arma colligunt.* Says S. Prosper, *They take vp the broken weapons of their brethren.* As some rivers pass vnperceived for some space vnder ground, & then rise again: so that, so other Objections against the *Church.* And if I am not mistaken in the *Horoscope* of this Argument drawn from sense against *Transubstantiation*, it will run the same fate, for while a loue of separation continues, these or some other pretexts will be vsed to excuse it.

Wherefore *The only meanes to put a good end to all Disputes in Religion, is to procure a sincere Loue of Peace, & mutual communion.*

The differences, says this Lord, *are not so many, nor so great, but meanes may be found to reconcile the two Churchs.* I hope there may be meanes found, thô this grounds not my hope: for I do on the contrary aver that there never were any *Hereticks* of one denomination, who haue erred in more, or more material points, then *Protestants.* For to say nothing of several, & almost all antiquated Heresyes received by them, they haue cut off all the vnwritten, & a great part of the written word of God: destroyed, or which is all one, confounded the Hierarchy of the Church: cast away fiue Sacraments, & deprived the other two of their efficacy, & reduced them to the condition of Iewish rites, to be *Beggerly elements*: denyed the vniversal redemption, banisht Free will, introduced stoick Fate: changed Hope into Presumption (a sin against the Holy Ghost) & so commended Faith, as to destroy charity: made good, & bad workes indifferent, by depriving those of merit, & these of offending God in his elect. &c. Besides many points of discipline, which thô lesse considerable, than those of Faith, yet are not to be neglected

neglected, which no *Church of England man* will deny seing he defends those retained in it against the *Presbiterians*. If these be *Small points*, what are *Great*? And if these be not *Many*, what Herēsy ever had many? It will not be enough to say, the *Church of England* doth not oblige her Children to beleiue all these: for shee ownes Communion with those, who do, & abetteth her children, when they reproach vs, with the contrary Truths.

But suppose there were but *Few*, but *One difference*, & that inconsiderable in it self, yet if it causes a *Schism*, it destroys all hope of *Salvation*. Now what comfort is it to a wounded man, to tell him, he hath but one wound, & that not great, if that touch the hart, & is mortal? The *Novatians*, the *Miletians*, the *Quartadecimans*, the *Donatists*, &c. were tru *Schismaticks*, & could not be saved altho each of them differred from *Catholicks*, but in one point, & that not of *Faith*; but of *Ecclesiastical Discipline*. And they were as obstinate in the defense of that one, as others in that of many great ones. The fewer, & lesse considerable the points are, betwixt vs, & the *Protestants*, the greater is their guilt in dividing Communion on that score.

All spiritual & temporal jurisdiction, the Authority of Prelate, & Prince, is derived from the same fountain, God. *There is no power but of God, & the Powers that be, are ordained of God.* Rom. 13. 1. The same persons are subject to both (*Let every soul be subject to hygher Powers*) And this out of the same principle of conscience. *Whosoever therefore resists the Power, resists the ordinance of God . . . . Wherefore ye must needes be subject not only for wrath; but also for conscience sake.* The same motiues are alleaged to excuse the Disobedience to both, Abuses in government, heavy & vnnecessary Impositions, greivances, &c. The same pretexts serue to make the Rebellious Actions against both plausible; Evangelical Liberty, Reformation, Reestablishment of ancient forme of Government, &c. Stubbornesse in the Rebellious is covered with the same fig-leaues, Complaints of greivances not harkned to, petitions for

for Redresses vnregarded, humble Addresses not effectual. Alike Art vsed, to conceal a resolution never to be satisfyed, what ever Answer be returned: for if one request be granted, they will demand more: if denyed, than they perswade their followers, they are slyghted, that no good can be hoped from such persons, & that things must be redrest without them. Then they teach that all Power is derived (not from God, as the Apostle says) but from the People: that their superiours are only their Commissioners, & accountable to them, & these having abused their Power, may, nay ought to be devested of it. And so they proceed to change the establisht Government in Church & state: alleadging the Bible, as the Rule of their Actions against the Head of the Church, & ancient Statutes, those against the Prince, yet wresting both to their capricios; not framing these to those. In reality making all Government in Church & state subservient to their Interests. All which are written with a sun beame in the Hystorys of our civil wars in *England*, & those of the first Reformation in *Germany*, *France*, *Scotland*, & *England* too.

So chang in Church & state are begun with lamentations, & bemoanings of the People greived, & overcharged: carryed on with Humble Addresses & Petitions: & end in confusion & destruction.

Hence it appeares how dangerous it is for a Prince to countenance those Pretences to Liberty against the Prelate, with in his dominions. What is sawce for à goos, is sawce for a gander. Both hold their Authority, on the same tenure: what strikes at one, wounds the other. That Principle which shakes the miter, endangers the Crown, who breakes the *Crozier* would crack the scepter: for both are made sacred by the same divine Ryght. Soe who dares oppose the one, is disposed to shake hands with his duty to the other: The differences betwixt them, being no other, but only, as of more, & lesse in the same kind.

2. Your care of not exposing your dear self to danger is laudable, if that were so great, as to exceed that of *Preists* in *England*.

But are *Preists* so safe in *England* & *Ministers* in such danger at *Brussels*? Did you blush, or smile, when you sayd, & printed this, at this time of day? Had you sayd it was vnsafe at *Brussels*, it myght haue past, & your Prudence commended: but J doubt whether that comparison was Prudent. Look towards *Tyburne* or *Tower-Hill*, *Westminister Hall*, or old *Bayly*: & then tell me whether it is so safe in *England* for *Preists* &c. Then cast your eye back on *Brussels*, & see whether in any corner of the town you discover such Tragical scenes. J grant, that some, nay many of the *Ch. of Eng.* Are so moderate as not to prosecute a Preist, though known to be such, & J beleiue you to be of the number. Yet this is no security for a Preist, when knowen, when any one more Zealous, or malicious may cause him to be apprehended, & brought to the Barr, where he shall vnavoydably be condemned. And what greater danger can hang over a minister in *Madrid*, or *Rome* it self, before the face of an *Inquisitor*?

God will in due time discover the Authours of such crueltys, as at certain Periods of time are exercised vpon Preists guilty of no crime, vnlesse Preisthood be one. I know the cheife Actors in the late Tragedy were as little freinds to the Hierarchy of the *Ch. of Eng.* (& to *Monarchy* too) as to that of *Rome*: & that those *Circumcellions*, or *Cannibals* intended to breakfast on vs, dine on the *Protestant Clergy*, & sup on the *Royal Family*. Yet those who loue the cause, do not hate the effect: & those who concurred to the making, & oppose the repealing of the penal sanguinary laws, will not break their harts, with greife to se them at least some times executed.

But you cheered vp, having F. Darcy's hand & word, for your security. And now begins the dispute.

SECTION

SECTION III.

1. *Little good from Conference.*

2. *Catholicks ready to comply in what they can.*

3. *Communion of Infants how beleived anciently.*

1. D. Morley sayd *There could little fruit be expected from a Conference, when one side is resolved to remit nothing.*

2. F. Darcy *Answered they would not be so stiffe in all points: for the* Church *might alter some thing in order to Christian Peace, in things of Ecclesiastical constitution: as* v. c. *The latin service, the Sacrament vnder one kind, & the celibate of Preists: thô not in things of* Faith, *such as is the Church's* Infallibility.

3. D. Morley *Replyed: If by the* Church *he meant all* Christians *in all places, it could not erre. If any particular* Church, v. c. *That of Rome, it could erre, & had erred, which he proved thus.*

That Church, *which formerly held as matter of* Faith *an errour, hath erred, & can erre. But this is the case of the* Church *of* Rome: *Therefore it hath erred, and can erre.*

To proue the minor, he instanced in the Communion of Infants, *beleived to be necessary to salvation. For which he quoted* Innocent 1. S. *Austin, Binius, &* Maldonate. *This last says for six hundred yeares it was* Dogma de Fide vniversalis Ecclesiæ.

1. Revisor. you approved here, what I haue at larg proved aboue: little good from *Conferences* in matters of Religion can be expected. But you haue a sting in the end; when you reject all the fault, all the opposition of so great a good, as the *Peace of the Ch.* on vs. *Who are resolved to remit nothing.* A very vncharitable, & rash judgment. And vntru to boote, as appeares by F. *Darcys* reply & by that story which *Protestants* with great confidence relate in Q. *Elisabeths* time, viz, that the Pope offred to confirm all she had don in Church affayres, vpon condition she would acknowledg

him. How can you say *We will remit nothing*, when your Brethren assure the Pope was ready to remit all? But it is your fashion, to say, & vnsay, as you think for your present purpose. Then it served your turn, that the Pope did not dislike your *Reformation*, to moue *Catholicks* to embrace it, & so you spread that report. Now it is to your purpose to throw the odium of the division on the *Popes inflexibility*: & so you report that. The tru, & only reason, that the schismatical Party is resolved never to rest satisfyed, with what is remitted. So the rebellious Part of the Parliament resolved never to be satisfyed with what soever answer the King gaue to their Addresses: & for that Reason we might say, all Treatys for peace betwixt the King & Parliament would proue ineffectual.

2. F. *Darcys* answer shews how desirous the Church is to restore *Peace* to *Christendome*, being ready, for so great a good, to remit of her Ryght in imposing ceremonys, & making Canons. In *Faith* she can change nothing, that belongs to a higher Tribunal, she receiues it from her spouse, in the nature of a *Depositum*, (1. Tim 6. 20.) which must not be altred. But *Ecclesiastical Discipline*, being lef to her determination, & of her own appointement, she may change, & as the Father sayd, will change, if by that meanes she could restore to the sheep-fold of *Christ*, all his strayed sheep. This is more than the *Ch. of Engl.* will do: seing to reclaime her vnduti ful children she will not omit the signe of the Crosse in Baptism, kneeling at the Sacrament, & bowing to the Altar, all ceremonys of humane institution, & her own injunction. Nay she would not alter some words in her *Lyturgy*, to purchase Peace..

3. If the *Church diffusivè*, that is all *Christians* in all places cannot erre, wo be to the first *Protestants*, whose sentiments in matters of *Faith* were as contrary to those of all *Christians* in all places, as to those of the *Roman Church*, except that one point of *Papal Power*. So if all *Christians* did not, & cannot erre, the first *Protestants* did erre; & all their followers doe erre, & will erre, as long as they retain those sentiments: for what is an errour to day, will be such

ſuch to morrow, & to the end of the world.

As to the *Communion of Infants*: I acknowledg, that for a long time, when *Baptiſm* was adminiſtred ſolemnly by *Bishops* to men grown vp, [*Adultis*] two other Sacraments were adminiſtred with it *Confirmation*, & the *Eucharist*. That when it was adminiſtred by *Preists*, they were ordred to anoint the baptiſed perſon not on the forehead; but on the crowne. That when *Infants* were baptiſed, because the Sacrament could not without danger, be adminiſtred to them vnder the ſpecies of Bread alone, it was giuen vnder the other ſpecies, the Preiſt dipping his finger into the Holy Chalice, gaue it them to ſuck or a little particle of the ſpecies of Bread ſoaked in the conſecrated wine was layd on their tongue. That the Communion was giuen to *Infants* out of an opinion, that it was neceſſary to ſalvation grounded on thoſe words of *Christ* Ioan. 6. *Vnleſſe ye eate the Body . . . . you haue no life in you.* I grant alſo that ſome, & haply many in ſome private Churchs beleived that to be the litteral meaning of thoſe words, & thought conſequently that ſenſe was *De fide*, a point of Faith. Yet I deny, that the vniverſal Church did erre in declarations, or definitions of Faith: for indeed she never made any definition in this matter. That Text was expoſed with the reſt of Holy writ to the view of all *Christians*, & left to the interpretation of ordinary *Paſtors*, as the reſt was. Many vnderſtood it litterally, & for that reaſon extended to *Infants* the Communion in *Baptiſm* ordained to men enjoying the vſe of Reaſon. The Church ſeing no preſſing inconvenience in this cuſtome, & conſequently no neceſſity to make a ſevere examen of the meaning of thoſe words, & a cenſure of an jnnocent errour, permits them to go on, without interpoſing her Authority, or by any legal definition obliging her children to beleiue either the one, or the other part. And I doubt not, but there are ſeveral other texts of ſcripture commonly vnderſtood one way, & that thought to be the litteral meaning, & tru ſenſe, & followed as ſuch, & ſome nay many, may beleiue that ſenſe to be *De fide*, & the Church permits

permits them to beleiue, & practice so, [not seing any necessity to call a General Council to decide it, the errour being nether destructiue to necessary Faith, nor good manners] & yet this sense may be different from that the Holy Ghost cheifly intended by those texts: & all this without any prejudice to the *Church* of Rome's infallibility, which never declared any thing in it. Such I think is the common way of explicating *Anti-Christ* to be one single man: & the three yeares & a halfe, to be litterally vnderstood, for forty two months vulgar. From alike occasion the error of the *Chiliasts*, or *Millenarians* had its rise, & progresse: which was not condemned, till its Abettars grew troublesome to those, who differed from them in the exposition of those words, Apoc. 20. 4. on which they grounded their error.

Hence it follows that what *Maldonate* says makes nothing against the Churchs infallibility in defining things of Faith, for he nether says, nor could say with truth, that she ever defined any thing in this matter. And the practice it self of communicating Infants cannot be proved to be vniversal, or in vse in the Roman Church. Some think the *Pelagians* introduced that custome: & that S. *Austin* proues thence the necessity of *Baptism argumento ad hominem*. By a reason drawn from their own sentiments. The same I say of *Binius*, & S. *Austin*: for both speake of the practice which they found, without citing any publick decree, for indeed there was none ever made, even by *Innocent* I. whom you cite. For the place you mean is in his answer to a letter written to him by the Fathers of the Council of *Milevis* in *Africa*, which had condemned *Pelagius* & *Celestius*, who taught there was no need of the grace of God to keep the commandments, & that children myght be saved without *Baptism*. *Innocent* approves their decrees: & proves none can be saved without *Baptism*, because none can be saved *Without eating the Body, & drinking the Bloud of Christ*. And he addes: *Qui vitam ijs sine regeneratione defendunt, videntur mihi ipsum baptismum velle cassare cùm prædicant hos habere, quod in eos creditur nonnisi baptismate conferendum.*

ferendum. Those, who hold they (the children *) may be saved without being regenerated, seeme to me, to take away Baptism it self, teaching that they haue without it, what we beleiue is not* giuen *but by Baptism.* Thus he; which words are cited by S. *Austin* l. 2. cont duas Ep. Pelag. c. 4. so what explicates one will serue the other, both saying the same thing.

Where it is certain, that he thinks a Participation of the Body & Bloud of Christ necessary to salvation. Now whether he meanes a real, & sacramental Participation, by receiving the Sacrament; or only a mystical, or spiritual Participation, which both you & we beleiue is attained by the Sacrament of *Baptism*, & is the constant doctrine of the *Church* to this day, seemes not so evident. You say he meanes the first; I say, the second, & this is my reason: He doth not speake of the participation by *Communion*, or the *Eucharist*; but of that by *Baptism*: for he doth not say: *Cum Baptismate conferendum*, as if some thing different from *Baptism*, & administred with it, were the medium of that Participation; but *Baptismate conferendum*, as if *Baptism*, were the sole cause or meanes, of that Participation. Now the participation of Christ's body by *Baptism*, is mystical, & not sacramental. Therefore he speakes of the mystical Participation of Christ's Body, & averres that to be necessary to salvation. Which both you, & I; both *Protestants* & *Papists* do admit for tru, & *Catholick doctrine.* How can you then hence inferre, that the *Church hath erred, & may erre?* This is my first answer.

A second is, that he & S. *Austin* speake of participation of the Body & Bloud of Christ, *In voto, in desire*, which all haue, & are bound to haue, when they are baptized.... A third is, that in decrees of Faith, or doctrinal, we make a great difference betwixt what is *Ex professo*, & directly treated, discussed, & defined, & such other things, as are only accidentally mentioned. Infallibility in the later points, is by vs esteemed a Priviledge reserved to the writers of Holy scripture, & not pretended to even by general councils: we make likewise a great difference betwixt a decree, & a reason

a reason for making the decree, & on which it is grounded. For example: in the 7. general Council, it is said, that Angels may be painted, because they haue bodys. We think our selves oblidged to beleiue Angels may be painted: but not that they haue Bodys: for our Divines commonly teach the contrary. Now to your objection, I answer, that *Innocent* mentions only accidentally that point of Infants Communion, & intends by it, only to proue that *Baptism* is necessary to salvation. So the real Communion is not held by vs, a decree of *Faith*.

Thus I haue once again broken that weapon which you brandish a new, althô you know it had been broken in *Viscount Falkland's* hand, whence you took it.

SECTION IV.

1. *No possibility of salvation in schisme.*
2. *Protestants truly Schismaticks.*
3. *Catholicks hold their salvation desperate.*
4. *A paralel betwixt Protestants, & Donatists.*

D. Morley, *The* Iesuit *sayd, that doubless it was more prudent, & safe, to venture a man's self in that Church where in all agree, he may besaved; than in one where in all* Catholicks *say a man cannot be saved.* The Doctor *replyed: it was rather the vsual saying, than the setled judgment of all* Catholicks: *for* F. knot *says the case may be such that a* Protestant, *dying such, may be saved; which is as much as* Protestants *grant to* Papists. *And then it would out of this reason follow, it were more safe to be of the* Donatists *perswasion, than a* Catholick: *for* S. *Austin granted that a* Donatist *could be saved; where as the* Donatists *did affirm, that who soever was not a* Donatist *could not besaved.*

Revisor.

Revisor. All the substance of what I will here say is contained in this syllogisme: *None out of the true Church of* Christ & a schismatick, *can be saved. The* Protestants *are out of the tru* Church *of* Christ or schismaticks. *Therefore they cannot be saved.*

The first Proposition or *Major*, that *none can be saved out of the tru* Church *of* Christ, is so cleere in scripture, in Fathers, & even in *Hereticks* themselues, that all must see it, who do not wilfully shut their eyes. My first Proofe, the Church is the Body of *Christ.* Colos. 1. 24. *For his* (Christ's) *Body which is the Church.* Vpon which words S. Austin discourses thus 1. lib. *Cont. Epistolam Petiliani Donat.* c. 2. *Vnde manifestum est eum, qui non est in membris Christi, Christianam salutem habere non posse. Membra vero Christi per vnitatis charitatem sibi copulantur, & per eandem capiti suo cohærent, quod est Christus Iesus. Hence it is evident, that who is not part of Christ's body cannot attain to Christian salvation. And those are in Christs body, who are linked together, & to their head with the loue of vnion.* And in his 19. Chapter. *Ad salutem, & vitam æternam nemo pervenit, nisi qui habet caput Christum. Habere autem caput Christum nemo poterit, nisi qui in eius corpore fuerit, quod est Ecclesia. No man can be saved, vnlesse Christ be his Head. But Christ can be head to no man, who is out of his Body, which is the Church.*

My 2. proofe Rom. 8. 9. *If any man haue not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his.* S. Austin alluding to these words, tract. 27. in Ioan says: *Christi spiritus neminem animat, qui non sit de corpore eius. Christs spirit doth quicken none but such as are in his Body*: that is in the Church.

3. Proofe: It seemes the express words of Christ Ioan. 15. 6. *If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, & is withered, & men gather them, & cast them into the fire, & they are burnt.* This is the doom of such as abandon Christ's Body, which is the *Church*, according to the expresse words of the Apostle Colos. 1. 24.

4. Proofe out of Fathers. S. *Austin*, l. 4. de Bapt. cont. Donat. C. 1. having sayd, that the rivers which risse in Paradise watred

Mesopotamia & *Ægipt*, thô these countryes were not partakers of the happinesse of Paradise: so *Baptism* may be had out of the *Church*; yet could not conveigh eternal Blis but to those who are within *It*, which hath received the keys to bind, & loose. And lib. cont. Faustum manich. 12. C. 17. *Præter arcam omnis caro*, &c. *Out of the Ark all creatures living on the Earth were destroyed by the deluge, because out of the Communion of the Church, the Water of Baptism, althô it be the same*, out, as in the Church; *yet it avayles not to salvation; but rather to ruin.*

S. *Cyprian* hath a long treatise against *Schismaticks*. In it he says, they are the work of the devil, who finding his Temples abandoned, his Altars overturned, his sacrifices contemned, his rites slyghted, & his kingdom destroyed by the conversion of the world to *Christianity*, with design to recover his interest on Earth, introduced *Schismes*, & multiplyed *Schismaticks*. And what opinion he S. *Cyprian* had of them take in these words: *Can he retain his Faith, who dos not retain the Communion of the Church? & can any man hope to be in the Church, who resists it? who abandons the Chair of Peter, upon which the Church is built? whosoever leaving the Church, cleaues to the Harlot, forgoes all promises made to the Church, he becomes a stranger, a prophane man, & an enemy. God is not a Father to him, who ownes not the Church his mother.* And he assures that nether Faith, nor working of miracles, nor knowledg of mysteryes, not martyrdom it self, can entitle a man to eternal life, who dyes in a *Schism*, that is out of the Communion of the *Church*.

To be short, see what the Fathers say severally against the *Meletians*, the *Quarto decimans*, the *Novatians*, the *Donatists*, & others. With what fervour they plead the necessity of Communion with the *Church*: & with what horror they reject the crime of *Schism* which some think the greatest of crimes.

My 5. proofe is, Remission of sins is necessary to attain Heaven. That is not to be found but in the *Church*. Wherefore in the Creed, after the Article of the *Holy Catholick Church*, two others are

are added: the *Communion of Saints*, & *Remission of Sins*, as being sequels of, & dependants on that other. Which is *Calvin's* Reflection.

My 6. Proofe is from the Testimony of such as were actual Schismaticks themselves. *Calvin* l. 4. Instit. C. 1. S. 4. says: *Discamus ex hoc vno matris Elogio quam vtilis sit nobis Ecclesiæ Communio, imo necessaria: quando non alius est ad vitam ingressus, nisi nos ipsa concipiat in vtero, nisi pariat, nisi nos alat suis vberibus, denique sub custodiâ, & gubernatione nos teneat, donec exuti carne mortali, similes erimus Angelis .... Adde quod extra eius gremium nulla speranda est peccatorum remissio nec vlla salus.* The Church is our *Mother: out of which title wee may learne how vsefull, nay how necessary is our Communion with her: seing there is no possibility of attaining to life vnlesse shee conceiues vs in her wombe, brings vs forth, suckles vs with her breasts, protect, & defends vs till leaving this mortal life, we become like vnto Angels .... Out of her bosome no hopes of Remission of Sins, nor of salvation.* Whence he concludes: *Semper exitialis est ab Ecclesiâ discessio. It is always damnable to depart from the Church.* Thus this grand sower of *Schismes*, the greatest Enemy to Church Communion, that ever was: whose furious spirit communicated with his writings hath caused more discords, Schismes, Seditions, Rebellions & Murthers, than all other sects together: His followers sometimes wanting Power; but never the will to introduce those plagues their ordinary Attendants.

How odjous this sin is, appeares by the industry all *Hereticks* vse, to remoue it from themselves, & charge it on the *Catholicks*: as knowing it to be of so deformed a nature that nothing can excuse it: & the stain it leaues of soo deep a dye, that a floud of Teares cannot wash it out. Thus mnch to proue the major, or first Proposition. I passe now to the minor, or second.

2. That *Protestants* are out of the tru Church, the body of Christ, & tru *Schismaticks* is evident. *Luther*, their *Pratriarck* renounced all Communion with the *Roman Church*: & nether before, nor after

communicated with any *Church*, even *Schismatick*. So he separated, when he began to Dogmatize from all *Christians* living, for he had not gotten followers, & consequently had not framed them into a *Church*. Wherefore if ever any one was a *Schismatick*, he was one. Such were likewise those who joyned with him in that sinfull separation. And he, and they continued such, till their dying day, even when framed into a Congregation: for *Non firmatur tractu temporis, quod ab initio de jure non subsistit. Reg. Iuris.* Processe of time cannot make an Action legal, which from the beginning is contrary to law. Perseverance in sin is a circumstance, which aggravates it: & it is a Paradox to say, that a hainous crime should cease to be such, for being long continued: as if the devil could become a saint, by being obstinate in his wickedness. A new way to sanctity, vnknown to ancients. So my minor is vndeniable.

So then the first *Protestant* made a tru *Schism*: those, who joined in Communion with him, joined in a tru *Schisme*: & those, who continu in it, are in a tru *Schisme*, & tru *Schismaticks*. So *The guilt of Schisme*, (a sin of the first magnitude) *lyes at the Protestants doore: they are* [Say Papists] *If they liue & dye Protestants, with out hopes of salvation, as living & dying in a greivous mortal sin.* Which is the conclusion of that syllogisme.

You say 1. that we forced you vpon the separation by imposing vpon our Communion vnlawfull conditions. Which is *Gratis dictum*, sayd without any sufficient proofe: for no one point of our faith was ever proved false by you, we having much stronger grounds, for, than you again it. So the most you can draw from your reasons is that our doctrine is not absolutely certain: whereas nothing can excuse your *Schisme*, but an absolute total certainty, that the thing is naught, which we enjoine. v. c. *Prayers to Saints*: because you ran in to *Schisme*, to avoyd a thing, which you know not certainly whether it be good, or bad. Nay you haue much greater reason to judge good, than otherwise, 1. for the authority of the past, & present Church practising it: & 2. because you rather reproach

reproach vs with indiſcreet ſpeeches of pious men, or ſome practice of ſilly women, then with the doctrine of the *Church*, defined in our Councils. Which shews you haue little to ſay againſt our Church doctrine, which is the only thing we enjoin. So you are inexcuſable.

Indeed theſe reproaches of errours are not the cauſe; but the effect of your ſeparation. For out of loue to dear lyberty, you reſolved to renounce all ſubjection to Chriſt's vicar vpon earth: then to ſecure this, you reſolved to ſeparate from his Communion by a *Schiſme*; to juſtify this *Schiſme*, theſe pretexts were invented. Aud by a juſt judgment of God the diſobedient children of your *Church*, haue meeted you the ſame meſure & framed in your boſome another *Schiſme* on the ſame pretences.

You ſay 2. Our excommunicating you was the cauſe of the *Schiſme*: ſo the cauſal Schiſme is on our ſide. But this is far from ſatisfiying any thinking man, who calls to mind, that you had forced the excommunication by precedent & juſtifyed it by ſubſequent crimes. Before any ſentence was pronounced againſt you, you had broke the interiour Communion with the *Church*, by altering Faith, & the exteriour Communion, by renouncing obedience to the Head of the *Church*; ſo the *Excommunication* was ſubſequent to the *Schiſme*: & what did the Reformation begun before, but perfected after that clap of thunder? Erection of one Altar againſt another, or rather deſtruction of all Altars: profanation of Churchs, robbery of all ſacred veſſels, & ornaments, purſuing with fire & ſword theſe who for conſcience ſake remained in the *Catholick Communion*. Now what hopes of ſalvation left? None vnleſſe Schiſm, ſacriledge, rapine, CALVMNY, PERIVRY, MVRTHER, & Hereſy, be venial ſins, & though vnrepented, leaue hopes of ſalvation? For the guilt of all theſe, & many more ye haue contracted, ſince your ſeparation from the center of Eccleſiaſtical Communion. So your debt contracted by the ſeparation is great: but your following demeanour hath enflamed your reckoning to a prodigious ſumme, not

to be

to be diſcharged with any ordinary ſatisfaction: & which is yet encreaſed by a pretence to jnnocency, & a reſolution to juſtify all theſe crying ſins.

I acknowledge with S. *Auſtin l. 6. de verâ Relig.* C. 6. that ſome jnnocent perſons by Eccleſiaſtical cenſures may be caſt out of the exteriour Communion of the *Church*: that *De facto*, this hath happned to ſome: that ſuch Perſons interiourly retaine the Communion with the faithfull provided they containe themſelves *Intra limites inculpatæ tutelæ*, do nothing vnlawfull, beare their croſſe patiently, invent no errours, practice nothing for revenge, attempt not to break open the *Church* dores, to force a readmittance, nor barre them vp, to hinder it: do not endeavour to withdraw others from the *Church*, to encreaſe the number of ſeparatiſts, & make themſelves conſiderable, by becoming heads of a Party. Giue me ſuch a man, & thô he ſeeme to liue, & dye in a *Schiſme*, J ſhall hope for his ſalvation, with S. *Auſtin.* Who ſe words are theſe: *Sinit diuina providentia per nonnullas nimium turbulentas carnalium hominum ſediditiones, expelli de Congregatione Chriſtianâ etiam bonos viros, quam contumeliam, vel iniuriam ſuam, cum patientiſſimè pro Eccleſiæ pace tulerint, neque vllas novitates vel ſchiſmatis, vel hæreſis moliti fuerint: docebunt homines quam vero affectu & quantâ ſinceritate charitatis Deo ſerviendum ſit. Talium ergo virorum propoſitum eſt, aut ſedatis remeare turbinibus, aut ſi id non ſinantur, vel eâdem tempeſtate perſeverante, vel ne de ſuo reditu talis, aut gravior oriatur, tenent voluntatem conſulendi etiam ijs ipſis, quorum motibus, perturbationibuſque ceſſerunt, ſine vllâ conventiculorum ſegregatione, vſque ad mortem defendentes, & teſtimomio iuvantes eam Fidem, quam in Eccleſiâ Catholicâ prædicari ſciunt. Hos coronat in occulto Pater, in occulto videns.* Thus S. *Auſtin*: *divine providence ſome times permits* that even *good men are by turbulent ſpirits caſt out of the Church: who if they beare patiently this diſgrace, & wrong, for the Peace of the Church, without endeavouring to frame a Shiſme, or broach Hereſyes, they will by their example teach men, with what ſincere charity they ought to ſerue God. Such men intend ether to*

returne

return to the Church, When the storme is blown over, or if they cannot return, ether because the stormes ceases not, or to prevent another storm continue quietly, without gathering conventicles, defending to their Power that Faith, which they know is taught in the Church. Such as these are crowned in secret, by the Father, who seeth in secret.

How many are there of your Party, who haue thus peaceably demeaned themselves? I meane of the more conspicuous & governing, or leading part? *Vix totidem, quot Thebarum Portæ vel divitis ostia nili.*

Scarce as many, as the *Muses*, or even the *Graces*. Soe the number, that on this score can pretend to salvation, is very inconsiderable. For the rest, how different is their proceeding from the others, of whom S. *Austin* hopes well? these beare the wrong done to them patiently for the loue of peace of the Church, you by tongue & pen, & hands shew your Passion. These introduces no noveltys, & cause no Schismes, or Heresyes; you do the contrary. These desire, to return to the Church, the storme being over; you raise new stormes, & endeavour to perpetuate the separation. These defend the Faith preacht in the Church; you impugn it. Those loue Peace; you hate it, & persecute all promoters of it. These are guilty of no crime, which may deserue the Churchs censure; you haue provoked the Heads of the Church, to inflict on you such a punishment. These are ready to vndergo any Penalty, without deserving it, you deserue it, & will vndergo none. In fine these are innocent; you guilty, & guilty of a great crime, & aggravate it, by glorying in it, *Peccatum suum sicut Sodoma prædicaverunt.* So we must conclude, that their example serves not to justify, but to condemne you, who differ so much from them, & therefore thô we grant with that great saint, that *There is life in the way of these; yet your way leads to Death.*

3. Wherefore it is both an *Vsual saying*, & a *Setled judgment* of *Catholicks*, that *Protestants* remaining such, cannot be saved. Because that name imports two greivous sins: *Schisme*, by separation from the

the Communion of the *Church*, & *Heresy*, by beleiving errours contrary to *Faith*. Which two sins taken severally, or together; make vs despayr of their salvation.

You pretend, *Protestants* will say the like of *Papists*. I reply, it may be so: but haue they such strong grounds, for that saying, as *Catholicks* haue. In 1642. the Factious part of the Parliament did vie with the loyal & peaceable party in verbal expressions of Duty & Allegiance to their soverain. But on the one side were only words; & reality on the other: & it was I think not necessary, to cast a figure, to discerne which side only pretended Allegiance; but intended the contrary. And it is as visible, whether side in Religion aimes at Peace, & maintaines the ancient Faith, & which innovates, the wordes of both partys being vncyphered by their actions, the best interpreters of them.

Wherefore F. *Darcy's* argument remaines in force, that it is safer to joine with the *Catholicks*, than with the *Protestants* (as it was safer to avoyd Treason, to joine with the king, than with the Parliament) there being no sin in remaining in the Communion of the *Catholick Church*: & two great sins, *Schism*, & *Heresy*, in joining with the *Protestants*.

You say, that this Reason would proue, that in S. *Austin's* time, it was safer to joine with the *Donatists*, than with the *Catholicks*, seing both sides agreed that the *Donatists* could be saved; & the *Donatists* denyed that possibility to the *Catholicks*. Answer: you are here grossely mistaken [pardon that word] for S. *Austin* never sayd a *Donatist* remaining such *Could be saved*; nay a great part of his workes against them is employed to proue, that they cannot be saved, that their *Baptism* avayles them nothing, but serues for their greater damnation. Let me beseech you, only to open any leafe, any page, of the several bookes written against them, there is none, which will not correct that mistake. What you should say is, only, that both sides owned tru *Baptism* amongst the *Donatists*; which these denyed amongst *Catholicks*. Which argument the *Donatists*

natists not only myght; but did make vse of, to pervert *Catholicks*, as you may see in S. *Austin* L. 1. *de Bapt. cont. Donat.* c. 3. & l. 2. *cont. Petilianum*, c. 108. & else where.

To this I answer, that such a reason from a *Donatist* to a *Catholick* is of no force, he having no good ground at all for that reason to rely on, & therefore denying *Baptisme* in the *Catholick Church*, only out of a peevishnesse of nature, & Religion: & it was by them sayd with no more cause, than *Quakers* had to say: *Thou art damned*, when they had nothing else to say. Where as *Catholicks* proue that Assertion of theirs with jrrefragable reason, drawn from those two crying sins, *Schisme*, & *Heresy*, of which we accuse the *Protestants*, & these do not, nay cannot sufficiently cleere. I haue all ready explicated these reasons. That those of the *Donatists* were frivolous, is evident, for they sayd: some Bishops of the *Catholick Communion* were *Traditores*, had delivered the sacred bookes to the Persecutors, & that all *Catholicks* by communicating with them, did contract the same guilt, & had lost the *Holy Ghost*. And hence they inferred, there could be no valid *Baptisme* in the *Catholick Communion*: for those who haue not the Holy Ghost, cannot give him to others.

To which the *Catholicks* answered, 1. that those Bishops accused of that shamefull compliance with the jmperial Edicts against *Christians*, were jnnocent of that crime, which was never sufficiently proved vpon them: & no man ought to be condemned vnlesse the crime be evidently proved against him.

2. They answered, that althô the persons accused were really guilty, yet their personal guilt could not prejudice all *Catholicks* communicating with them: because another man's sin cannot prejudice me, vnlesse J make it my own by commanding, or perswading, approving, defending, or imitating it. Now the *Catholicks* were so far from being accessory to that pretended sin in another, that they detested the sin, & always condemned it, in all persons, who were really guilty of it: but never could find sufficient grounds to pronounce those accused by the *Donatists* guilty of it, as those would haue them doe.

They answered 3. that supposing (not granting) that the Persons accused were really guilty, & that guilt had infected the whole body of *Catholicks*, by communicating with them: yet their *Baptism* myght be valid, this not depending on the Personal sanctity of its Minister, but on the institution, & promises of *Christ*, & the operation of the *Holy Ghost*. Hence S. *Austin* sayd he did not regard *Peter* when he Baptizes, nor *Paul*, nor *Iohn*, nor *Iudas*; but he considered the *Holy Ghost*, who is the *Baptist*, who ever he be who washes the body, & pronounces the words, as Minister of that Sacrament.

You se how frivolous the reasons of the *Donatists* were, to deny the validity of *Baptism* in the *Catholick Church*. Shew that ours are as frivolous, & I will grant the parity: but this you can never doe. So our Reason stands good against you; that of the *Donatists* against vs falls to the ground.

It seemes not discreet in an *English Protestant* to mention the *Donatists*, there being so great a resemblance betwixt these two schismatical Churchs, that they may seem sisters, & the later to haue copyed the other: which appeares by these paralel points.

1. *Donatists* were no where out of one corner of the world, *Africa*: & *Protestants* of the Church of Eng. [that is such as agree with her in points of Doctrine, & *Hierarchy*] no where out of England.

2. *Donatists* sayd theirs was the only perfect, vnspotted Church; you say yours is the only Apostolical Church, perfectly reformed &c.

3. Those endeavoured to justify their separation with some pretended faults of particular men: you to justify yours alleadg some indiscreet devotions of old women, and vnwary words of some (otherwise) pious Authours.

4. Those appealed to some parts of scripture, which you vse against vs; And the Fathers proved against them the *Vniversality of the Church*, & the *necessity of Communion with her*, out of the same texts, which we vse against you.

5. *Donatists* called *Rome* the seat, or Chair of pestilence; you call it a *Pest-house*, [letter to her R. H. P. 17.] & the seat of *Antichrist*.

6. Those

6. Those had their *Circumcellions*, who thought to do God good service, in murthering *Catholicks*: you haue some of the same persuasion, as appeares by their workes. Yet I own a great difference betwixt the old *Circumcellions*, & the new ones: Those, when the toy took them, would ether break their own necks, or force others to cut their throates; & the new ones in this do not imitate them, they loue too much their mothers sons.

7. Those had the *Maximianists*, who left them for the same reasons, they had broken off Communion with the *Church*, these haue the *Presbiterians*, & others, who will not conforme with them vpon the same grounds, for which they refuse to conform to the *Catholick Church*.

8. And lastly: the *Non-conformist donatists* made evident to the world, that the *Donatists* had no real ground to break the *Catholick Communion*, by forcing them to solue their owne Objections against the *Church*, [of which S. *Austin* l. 2. Retract. C. 35.] And your *Non conformists* with the same successe force you to answer all your pretences against vs, & breake those weapons, with which you haue hitherto fought against the Church.

Those who will take the paines to examin further the *Donatists* principles, will discover more points of agreement betwixt them, & you. These are sufficient to shew, that what is now hath been before, & will be: & that as the *Church* sticks constantly through all ages to the same *Faith*, & ways of defending it; so Factious spirits, & seditious Brethren break her *Communion*, turn *Schismaticks*, broach *Heresyes*, & impugn her, & defend themselves, with the same principles.

I am now arrived at the end of this real, or pretended *Conference*, without omitting any one material point of it. I hope I haue given reasonable satisfaction; of which others will judge more impartially, then my selfe, if I am mistaken, by judging too favourably of my owne labours, & my replyes be found vnsatisfactory, I desire that defect be charged on my weakenesse; not on the cause,

I defend, which is invincible, being ſecured by the promiſe of *Chriſt* from all poſſibility of errour, for *Againſt it the gates of Hell shall never prevayle.* I haue given a reaſon in the preface, why I take no notice of the Father's anſwers, as they are couched in this Relation. My intention is only to defend the *Church*, from the Objections of the Learned Doctor. To which it is enough, to shew, (as I think I haue don) that his Premiſſes are falſe, his Jllations incoherent, & his whole diſcourſe not convincing. Thus *Wiſdome is juſtified of her children.* Mat. 11. 19.

THE SECOND BOOK.

A REVISION

OF THE ARGVMENT FROM SENSES AGAINST TRANSVBSTANTIATION.

THE PREFACE.

I Never began to read any Treatiſe with greater *Horrour*, nor ended, with greater *Indignation*, than this, which J now come to review. *Horrour*, to ſee doubts of divine Doctrine ſubmitted to the depoſitions of facultys common to Beaſts, a jury of the *Senſes* impanelled to decide controverſys of *Faith*, & ſet on a throne, to judge the judg of the world, & determine the meaning of the words of eternal Truth, of divine veracity, althô they are vncapable of vnderſtanding the words of the meaneſt vnderſtanding, & moſt illiterate Peſant. I expect shortly to ſee ſome other appeal to *Beaſts* ſeing many of the

the better ſort of theſe ſurpaſſe man, as to quickneſſe of *Senſes*, which in them are much more perfect, then in moſt, if not al men: & therefore may be ſayd to be more competent judges of the objects of *Senſes*, then men can be. Indeed *Seducers proficiunt in peius*, wax worſe, & worſe, 2. Tim. 2. 13. & it is not ſo great a ſtep from the *Senſes of men*, to thoſe of *Beaſts*, (which are of the ſame *Species*, & are rather more, than leſſe perfect in their kind) as it is from the *Church directed by the Holy Ghoſt, for our inſtruction in Faith*, to *Carnal ſenſes:* That having ſomething of divine, by reaſon of the Holy Ghoſt aſſiſting; theſe being meere *Corporal*, & below all that hath any thing of Reaſon. A fit judge indeed for ſuch a *Church*, as the *Proteſtant* is!

My horrour changed into *Indignation*, when I heard the *Verdict* brought in by this *Iury*, the *Sentence* pronounced by this *Vmpire*, this *Brutish judge* [yet from ſuch a *Iudg* little leſſe could be hoped for, in ſuch a matter] by which, the *Scripture* is ſilenced, *Tradition* trampled vnder foot, *Fathers* rejected, the *Practice* & *Faith* of the whole *Catholick Church* condemned, the *Communion* with all Faith full, all the Catholick Church renounced, & a horrid & execrable *Schiſme* authorized, And all this vpon the depoſition of ſo vile a witneſſe, & by the *Sentence* of ſo contemptible a judg, as *Carnal ſenſe*. And this *Sentence* accepted of, recommended by a learned Doctor of divinity, & a pretended *Ryght Reverend Bishop*. Is *Chriſtianity*, is *Divine Faith* brought to this?

Yet I find one ſign of *Modeſty* (vnleſſe it were rather *Cunning*, & craftineſſe in adorning the ſtage for this piece of Pageantry, & diſpoſing for this extravagant judgment) that there is ether no mention at all, of the grounds of *Catholick Faith* in this treatiſe: or elſe it is ſo ſilent, & low a mention, that it is ſcarce perceptible. For had you ſet before the eyes of your Readers, the practice of the *Church*, the Teſtimonys of Fathers, the decrees of councils, the written, & vnwritten word of God, in fine the vnanimous vote of the primitiue & preſent *Church*, averring that to be *Chriſts Body*

& Bloud

& Bloud, the Readers would not haue heard the sentence of this mock judg, would haue pulled him off the Bench, & forced him to yeild the victory to Truth. For if we *Must pull out our eye if it scandalize vs*: we must shut our eyes, stop our eares, renounce all our *Senses*, when thy contradict God's expresse word. But if by this you made sure of such a sentence, as you wisht, you discovered the vnjustice of it, by not admitting the plea of the contrary party. *For, qui statuit aliquid parte inauditâ alterâ, æquum licet statuerit, haud æquus fuit.*

This argument is not of the Doctors invention, it is as old, as the *Sacramentarian Heresy*. *Berengarius* vsed it, so did *Zuinglius*, & *Calvin*, & E. *Stillingfleet*, & G. *Burnet*. And the answer is as common. To confute this Treatise it were enough to reprint the 33. Chapter of *Anti-Haman*: so no new reply is necessary. Yet least he think himself neglected, I will review what he says.

SECTION V.

1. *Ancient Fathers re'yed not on sense.*

2. *S. Paul teaches the senses are not to be relyed on.*

3. *Reason convinces the same.*

S*Enses* no competent judges in this Controversy. Are not our *Senses* the same now, as they were a thousand or sixteen hundred yeares ago? Are their objects changed? Are not the sensations they cause the same now as then? Did not Bread tast like Bread, & wine like wine than, as well as now? Are not their colour, & odour the same at all times? And had not men then as much reason to rely on their *Senses*, in framing a judgment of their objects, as now? Sure they had. Now what judgments did Ancients frame of this object, in debate? Let S. *Cyril* of *Hierusalem* speak for all the rest.

Alibi

Altho it seemes to be Bread, yet it is not Bread: Altho it seemes to be Wine, yet it is not Wine. Thus this great saint, & ancient Father, delivering Christian Doctrine in a Catechisme. So this is not his private sentiment; but that of the Church, not things of his own invention; but of publick Tradition. Till then *Christians* retained a sincere, & entire veneration for the word of God; they harkned indeed to *Senses*; but more to God: & when these two interfered, one saying *That is Christ's Body*, the other it is not such, *It is Bread*, they did not hesitate which to follow, they easily resolved, pronounced in favour of Faith, & subscribed to the son of God, *Who had words of life, even life everlasting* .Io. 6. 69.

Animalis homo non percipit ea quæ sunt spiritus Dei, &c. says the Apostle, 1. Cor. 2. 14. *The natural man*, as your Translation hath it, *Receiues not the things of the spirit of God, for they are foolishnesse vnto him: nether can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.* Thus the Holy Apostle. is not *Faith* one thing of the spirit of God? Is it not of *Faith* [or revealed Truth preached by the Apostle] that he speakes in that place? Now if Faith be aboue the reach of the whole *Natural man*, how comes it to be below *Senses*, which are his lowest facultyes? Just as if what the Apostle says is over my head, you should say is vnder my feet. But why doth not the *Natural man receiue* Faith? Because *It is foolishnesse vnto him.* And just such is *Transubstantiation* to you, & therefore is laught at by you, the other reason is convincing: *He cannot receiue* Faith, *Becaus it is spiritually discerned.* Are *Senses* spiritual facultyes? can they *Spiritually discern*? If not [as certainly they cannot] pull them off the throne, on which you placed them, of which they are vnworthy as being vncapable of discerning the thing in question, which is of *The spirit of God, spiritual*, & *discerned only spiritually.*

No lesse; but rather more evident are the words of the same Apostle, 2. Cor. 10. 4. *The weapons of our warfare*, says he, *are not carnal; but myghty through God, to the pulling down of strong holds; casting down imaginations, & every hygh thing, that exalteth it selfe against*

against the knowledge of God: & bringing into captivity every Thought to the obedience of Christ . . . . do ye look on things after the outward appearance? Thus your own Translation Which words decide the thing in question: For first it is evident he speakes of the Doctrine he preacht, which is *Faith*. And in the first place he cleerely discards outward *Senses* from any share in this judgment? *The weapons of our warfare are not carnal*: now *Senses* are *Carnal*, as is cleere.

2. He rejects inward *Senses*: *Casting down all imaginations.*

3. He teaches that our vnderstanding must also be subject. *Bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ.*

Thus according to the Apostle, all facultys of soul & body, spiritual, & carnal, interiour, & exteriour, must vayle bonnet to Faith, which is termed *Myghty through God.* The last question, *Do ye look on things according to their outward appearance?* Is a conclusion of the foregoing discourse, & cuts all the nerves of the Doctors argument. Which is totally grounded *Vpon outward appearance to carnal sense.* Let vs apply the Apostles meaning to our present purpose, by some few questions.

What will you say that is, on the Holy Altar Mr. Dr? Answer: Bread & wine. But why do you think it to be bread & wine? Answer: wee *looke on the outward appearance, & judge of the thing after that.*

You know, sir, that the *Catholick Church* all over the world, even *Luther* himself, beleived it to be the Body & Bloud of *Christ*: with what weapons do you combat their opinion? Answer: *The weapons* we fyght with, are *Carnal*; they are the senses.

Now let vs propose such questions to a Catholick. What do you beleiue that to be, which is on the Altar? Answer: the tru Body & Bloud of Christ.

But why do you beleiue it to be the Body & Bloud of Christ? Answer: Because Christ says it is so: & the Church teaches me, his words are so to be vnderstood.

Doth it appear to be the Body & Bloud of Christ? Answer: no. But *We look not on things after the outward appearance*, when that is not

is not conformable to the word of God, delivered to vs by the Church.

With what weapons do you combat the contrary errour? Answer: *The weapons* we vse *Are not carnal* sense; *But myghty through God, to destroy all imaginations, & beate downe all thoughts* which are rayſed in vs in opposition to the divine, & revealed truth.

3. If we consult Reason in this debate, we shall see, that *Senses* ought not to be admitted as judges, it being absolutely impossible, they should vnderstand the matter in question: & therefore cannot possibly pronounce sentence, on ether side. For what is the question? What is the meaning of those words: of our Blessed saviour: *This is my Body: this is my Bloud*: for I suppose yonr impiety is not arrived to that heygth, as to deny his words to be tru: or say, you would not beleiue any thing to be, what he plainly, & vndeniably says it is. That is, you do not beleiue that God doth, or can tell a *Lye*. Otherwise farewell all Faith: & we must make vse of other *Mediums* to deale with you. Our dispute then being about the sense of those words of Christ, I proue, that our senses cannot judg in it, with this argument.

„ *Senses* cannot judg of things, which are not their proper objects:
„ But such are the things in debate in this controversy: Therefore
„ senses cannot judg of these things.

„ The major, or first Proposition is cleere. For the eye cannot
„ judg of a sound, because it is not its proper object. Nor the eare
„ of a colour for the same reason. The same of all other senses.
„ Wherefore no sense can judg of any thing, that is not its pro-
„ per object.

„ The minor, or second proposition, viz, things in debate here are
„ not the proper object of *Senses*, is also selfe evident: For the pro-
„ per meaning, or signification of words, is the proper object of
„ no sense. But the matter here in debate, is the proper meaning
„ or signification of the words of Christ. Therefore it is the proper
„ object of no sense.

These Premisses are so evidently tru, that I think it enough

 only

only to proue the first Proposition: & this I doe by induction, for nether eye, nor nose, nor palate, nor hand, nor eare can see, tast smel, feale, or heare the signification of words, wherefore no sense can perceiue it. The only doubt can be about Hearing, by reason of the convexion betwixt the sound of an Articulate word (which is the object of the eare) & the signification of it: yet even here my Proposition is tru: for the same articulate sound is insignificant to one who vnderstands it not: & sometimes signifyes different things to persons of different langages. v. c. *Lego*, to a Latinist signifyes *I reade*: to a Grecian, I speake: to an English man nothing. Yet the sound in the eare is the same to all these three. Jndeed if it were not so, by learning anew language, our eares should be changed, & framed in a different manner, to represent the new signification. Which I suppose no body will say.

As to the other Proposition [the minor] that our dispute is about the signification of those words, is as evident: For our sentiment is grounded on the words being taken litterally: y ours vpon their being taken figuratively. Both which are the severall signi fications.

One thing only occurres in answer to this, viz, that the litteral signification is so absurd, that it cannot be admitted. Answer: this is sayd, but not proved: & in du place these absurditys will be considered, & J hope found to be no absurditys. Answer 2. this doth not satisfy my reason: for no Absurdity can make any faculty judg of what it cannot know. As no Absurdity can make me a competent judg of a composition in the Chinese language, of which J am entirely ignorant.

Here I myght lay down my pen, it already appearing, that all you can alleadg from *Senses* can signify nothing, seing they cannot depose of a thing they are totally strangers to: & you say nothing but from *Senses*. Jt was indeed a great signe of a bad cause, when you appealed from the proper judges, to those, who are in competent: & there plead as earnestly, as if you were in earnest, when all is

all is only to amuſe your reader, by drawing his Attention, from what myght inſtruct him, to what cannot, as women amuſe children with Rattles. Indeed your diſcourſe, & theſe, are alike ſignificant, as will appeare, by diſcuſſing the particulars. I will before I paſſe to that, enquire further into the nature, & force of ſenſes.

SECTION VI.

1. *What nature cheifely intended by our ſenſes?*
2. *Deceipts of touching, taſting, & ſmelling.*
3. *Deceipts of the syght, & Hearing.*
4. *Senſes ought not to be attended, when they depoſe things contrary to the word of God.*

1. THat by our *Senſes* we come to the knowledg of ſeveral objects, is an vndoubted Truth. Our vnderſtanding by its Creation receives little or no knowledg at all, if we beleiue Phyloſophers: & therefore *Ariſtotle* compares it to a white Paper, or a cleere cloth to paint on, in which there is nether one letter written, nor one line drawne: the taske of filling vp that Paper, or table, being left to objects, which by the meanes of *Senſes*, as by their Pens, or Penſils, write or delineat their Reſemblances, or Pictures, [which are the knowledges, we haue of them] in our mind.

Some think this is as the moſt noble, ſo the moſt neceſſary work of ſenſes, & that which nature, in giving them to vs cheifely, & even onely intended. Others ſay this is onely an accidental, & additional employment ſcarce intended directly by nature: which in the firſt place deſigned them as ſo many life-guards, or ſentinells, to man, to diſcover, & giue timely notice of Approching objects, & their condition of Freinds, or Foes, good, or bad, hartfull,

 & diſple-

& displeasant; or pleasant, & confortable: to the end man myght not be surprised; but prepared to receiue those favourable, & reject & defend it selfe from the rest. This is the opinion of the french Authour of *The search of Truth*, in the first book of that work: in which by many instances, & experiences he proues that the *Senses* are frequently mistaken, & deceiue vs, when soever they stretch beyond that duty, of informing man of the advantage, or disadvantage he may receiue from an vnexpected, & otherwise vnknowne neyghbour: yet it is vndeniable, that they are subservient, & very officious in providing matter for the vnderstanding to worke vpon, & the syght aboue all the rest. Those who are desirous of larger proofes of the deceipts of those sentinels, & of the false allarmes they giue, may find satisfaction in that neate Authour. My designe being here no other, than to shew, that the *Senses* cannot be always relyed on, in the reports they make, it will be sufficient to proue by some few, but cleere, & vndeniable examples, that the *Senses* some, nay many times do misinforme vs, by representing things otherwise than they are; and (which is cheifely to our purpose) some times things, which are not.

First as to *Feeling*, or *Touching*, *Tactus*, those who haue lost aleg, or an Arme, feele many times the same paine, as it were in the hand, or foote, as if they had them. Mr. *Starkey* having in the Kings service lost aleg, felt a paine as in that foote [thô it had beene long before buryed] as if it were tickled in the sole with a Feather, sometimes as if it had beene trodden on: with a paine sometimes dull, sometimes quick, & sharpe, not only equal, to; but even surpassing those, which he had felt, before that losse. It is not to my purpose to enquire into, & explicate the causes of these effects, my designe not being to write of meere Phylosophical things, further then is necessary to discover that the *Senses*, of *Feeling* doth deceiue vs, by representing a substance, where there is none: & such is that sensation of a Feather tickling, and a foote, or some other hard body pressing vpon ours, althô this it self is no more in being.

Our

Our *Tast* doth in alike manner deceiue vs, for *Tobacco* being totally consumed in a Pipe, the Ayre sucked thorough it shall for a while haue the perfect tast of the smoke of *Tobacco* althô it be pure Ayre, with a tincture of the consumed weede from the warmed Pipe. Alike instance we haue in some cider (which S. *Austin* calls *Vinum vinosissimum de pomis*) and *Metheglin*, or *Hydromel*, which if good, & stale, & well kept, hath so strong a tast of *Aqua vitæ*, that some could scarce be perswaded, that one halfe of it, was not of that distilled liquour.

The *Smell* is the dullest, & easy est imposed vpon of all *Senses*. Hold a clod of bay salt, newly taken vp about *Broüage* in *France* [where there is always great quantity of it] to the nose of a man hoodwinkt, & he shall take it for a nosegay of violets.

3. The quickest, & least corporal of all our *Senses* is the syght: yet it is obnoxious to many deceipts. The appearances of a medal in abasin, full of water, which thô at the bottone seemes at the top: jtem of an oare, which halfe vnder water seemes broken, I omit, as trivial, & ordinary. Our syght discouers no distance betwixt the top of a hill, or the ridge of a house beyond which the moone rises: nay our eyes represent her as touching, or contiguous to them. It represents the sun, & moone as plaine, althô both be spherical. It represents the diameter of the moone (& sun) lesser when shee is in our meridian, then when she is rising aboue, or falling vnder our *Horison* : thô it should appeare greater as being a whole semidiameter of the Earth, neerer vs, when in our meridian, then when in the east or west, if she moues in a perfect circle. Our eyes represent the sun, & moone, as at an equal distance: & all the fixt starres, as in one planis sphere: which our new *Scepticks* will scarce assent to.

Our eyes in sublunary things are as vncertaine. Looke from a Bridge steedfastly on the water, & this shall seeme to stand, & the other moue. Inaship vnder sayl, the shore seemes to moue; & not the ship: Hence the Poet: *Terræque Vrbesque recedunt.*

we

we fixed ſtay
The land, & Townes do run away

Looke in a ſtreyght line with a Canon bullet, not withſtanding the the vnconceivable ſwiftneſſe of its motion, it will ſeeme to the eye to haue none at all, except a little falling towards the end. Of how many Angels do we reade in ſcriptures, who appeared like men? As *Raphael* to *Tobiae*, *Gabriel*, to *Zacharie*, & the Bleſſed Virgin; others to *Ioſue*, *Gedeon*, *Manue*, &c.? What variety of colours in a *Rainbow*, & a Pigeon's neck? Here ſome reflected lyght affects the eye as if it were real colours: & in the other examples, a little condenſed ayre lookes like the real body of a man. Examples of this nature myght be multiplyed without end, were it need full: but theſe are enough to proue, that our eyes are in many things miſtaken, repreſenting things in motion, which ſtir not; & in reſt others, which moue: shewing ſubſtance other then it is, & colours where there are none.

As for Hearing, ſome raving haue ſeemed to heare a conſort of muſicke. A perſon of my acquaintance was once awakened with an exceeding great noiſe, as if guns had ben shot off at his bed ſide. Calling to mind, that there was nether Canon, nor any thing elſe, neere, which could cauſe that vaſt noyſe, he concluded it muſt be ſomething in his eare; & picking it, he pulled out a little inſect, bred in ſome roſes, which the day before he had throwne over the teſter of his bed, which falling from them, & creeping into his eare, with the motion of its little tender feete cauſed that huge noyſe.

Whither theſe, & ſuch like inſtances of the vncertainty of our *Senſes*, ſufficiently proue, that they were not deſigned by the Authour of nature, God Almyghty, for inſtruments of ſciences, or to conveygh new notions into our mind, or only, as Guards, or ſentinels, for our ſecurity, & preſervation, (the only thing they can be deſigned for in Beaſts, thô theſe haue their *Senſes* as perfect, as men) I leaue to the judgment of others: as alſo to determine, whither

whither these examples can ground a judgment in that doubt. what I gather hence, is

That *Senses* are often mistaken, & that even about their proper objects. That these errours are sometimes corrected by our owne reason, or discourse, & some times by advice, or information from other men. For example: we know that on oare hath a strong consistency of parts, to which those of the water yeild, as having no consistency at all. Whence thô our eyes represent it, as broken in the water, we conclude their deposition false, 1. because water cannot breake a strong oare gently thrust into it, & 2. because if it were broken by the water, it would not be whole, when taken out, as we see it is. Thus reason corrects our eyes. By discourse likewise we find, that the diameter of the moone is much bigger, then a foote, as our eyes represent it. Now an illiterate Bumpkin, who knowes not how the tru quantity of a body seemes lesse, by reason of its distance from the eye, heares one, whome he beleiues to be a learned clark, say, the moone is bigger then all his grounds are, & he beleiues him: & vpon his credit, corrects that errour of his eyes. So he preferres the word of that learned man before his syght.

4. It is easy to draw from these premisses, the conclusion cheifely intended, viz, that it is rash, & presumptuous to alleadge, & rely on any sensation contrary to the word of God, or any revealed Truth. For if your reason, & discourse, or the Authority of a man, more knowing, & experienced then our selues are sufficient to make vs frame a judgment different from, or contrary to the depositions of the most perfect of our *Senses*, our eyes, with much greater reason ought we to suspect their depositions, nay & reject them, when we find them disagree from what God hath attested. For I hope the world is not brought as yet by Dogmatizers to such a degree of *Libertinisme*, & *Atheisme*, as to say, that God either can be deceived him selfe, through ignorance, or can maliciously deceiue vs. And if the credit of a man be sufficient to reforme the judgments

ments we frame on our sensations, shall that of God be lesse regarded? Wherefore we must nether prefer *Reason* before *Faith*, with *Socinus*: nor [which is worse] *Sense* before *Faith*, with Dr. *Morley*; but with S. *Paul*, & the Church, submit both *Sense*, & *Reason*, to *Faith*: & let *God be tru, & all men lyars.*

And this conclusion holds tru, whither one, or more *Senses* bepose the same thing, or whither the revealed Truth be confirmed by any *Sense*, or no: for if a clowne doth prudently prefer the word of one whome he thinks learned, before his syght, which no other sense doth, or can correct, it is certainly prudent to prefer the word of God before all *Senses*, & before our reason too.

SECTION VII.

How far senses are serviceable to Faith?

1. *Cartesian doubts destroy science, & human society.*

2. *Nature of Faith, as it comprehends divine & humane.*

3. *Two things necessary to a witnesse, knowledge & veracity.*

4. *Both eminent in the Apostles.*

5. *Miracles very serviceable to Faith.*

1. ALthô I think the *Senses* sometimes are, & often may be mistaken, & for that reason think we ought to reject their depositions, when they are contrary to such things, as we haue greater reason to trust to: yet I am far from the senseless errour of those, who say, no credit at all is du to them: or that by them we cannot be sufficiently assured, that we haue nether hornes, nor a coxcombe on our head, that our nose is nether the bille of a cocke, nor the trunk of an Elephant: or that our Body is flesh, & not

& not glasse, or butter. Which is the sentiment of the Authour of the *Search of Truth. Cartesius* teachs vs more, to doubt whither we are awake, or a sleepe, or haue any body at all. Which doubts, if really admitted, & not pretended only, afford an excellent pretext to all *Ignoramus jurys*: to all malefactours, who may pretend the witnesses are not certain of what they depose: to all Rebells, & Refractory subjects, who may alleadge their doubts against the King's Proclamation: lastly to all knaues, who may pretend ignorance of the promises, which they haue no mind to keepe. So this *Cartesian* way to knowledge, & certainty, by casting off all former knowledge, & senses, as vncertain, lays the Axe at the roote of all Authority, dissolues all bonds of commerce amongst men, & is only good to make *Scepticks*, & *Atheists* too, seing it leaues no certain meanes to teach, or learne *Faith*, & to vnderstand scripture, or Councils. So that nether Church, nor state can stand, if these doubts against the depositions of *Senses*, without any ground to the contrary, besides the general fallibility of our *Senses* themselues, be really admitted.

Wherefore when D. *Morley* often repeates, that we deny all authority to our *Senses*, he is either deceived himself, or deceiues his reader, which is worse: for we rely on our *Senses*, where Reason, or greater Authority doth not contradict them: of both which I haue giuen examples. So a man sees *Titius* kill *Simpronius*, & deposes it vpon oath: his deposition ought to be admitted, not withstanding all *Cartesian* doubts. So *Peter* relyes on a promise of *Paul* to Pay him within such a time, 100. l. *Paul* is bound to make it good, & *Peter* may exact it by law.

2. *Faith* taken generally, as it comprehends *Divine*, & *Humane*, is an Assent giuen to a thing as Tru, vpon the credit of another. In the first operation of our mind, which consists of single thoughts, called in our schooles, *Simple Apprehensions*, there can nether be Truth, nor Falshoode: these being propertyes of combined thoughts, which are called *Propositions* [these are the second operation of our

mind] for they are tru, when conformable to their object: as this *The whole is greater, then any part of it.* They are false, when not conformable to them, as this: *A part of a body is as greate, as the whole.* Some adde a third kind of Propositions, indifferent to Truth, & Falshood: but this is only relating to our minds, which are vncertain, whither they be tru or false. But in themselues they are determinately either tru or false, & it is as certaine they cannot be otherwise, as it is certaine, that a thing either is, or is not: it being impossible, that any thing should be, & not be, at the same time. That is to say, two contradictions can nether be tru, nor false.

This Truth, or conformity of a Proposition with its object, may be knowne several ways. 1. by its natiue lyght, & self evidence, of the thoughts themselues, which when well vnderstood, evidently appeare the same. For example *Two & two are four.* Item: *A streyght line is the shortest betwixt two points.*

2. By discourse: as when by the thoughts themselues it doth not appeare how they agree, we compare them with a third. Thus by applying a line to two bodyes, & finding it equal to each severally, we conclude they are both of an equall bigneſſe, 3. by sense: as when I see a man walke, I know he moues. 4. By report of another: as when a freind tells me, he *Saw the King a hunting*, I take it as a Truth, relying on his word. And this last way of knowing a thing to be tru, or giving Assent to it, is properly *Faith.*

3. Two things are necessary, to make this Assent prudent. 1. That he who relates the thing to me, (the witnesse) be not deceived himself. 2. That he doth not deceiue me. By reason of the first, we more readily credit an eye-witnesse, than any other, because a man is lesse obnoxious to mistake what he sees, than what he heares, or knows by conjectures. For the second, we easilyer beleiue an honest man, than any other: and we rather beleiue an honest man with an Oath, then without it: seing these are greater assurances, that he speakes his mind sincerely, & doth not deceiue vs. So an Oath is the strongest foundation of human *Faith*, wherefore by the

by the Apostle it is sayd to be *To men an End of all strife.* Heb. 6. 16. we will now apply this to *Divine Faith.*

Nothing can be more certain, than what God averres. Because he can nether be deceived, being *Omniscient*, or knowing all things: nor deceiue vs, by reason of his goodnesse. So we are never mistaken in beleiving him. But the assurance we haue of what any man says, even vpon Oath, is much lesse. For 1. he may deceived, & think, for example, he saw the King walking, when it was not the King; but some other Person like him. And 2. he may haue an intention to deceiue vs, by making vs beleiue, what he knows to be false: whence no man deserues greater credit, than his personal endowments beare: & to beleiue him further, is blamed in scripture, *He that is hasty to giue credit, is lyght minded.* Eccles. 19. 4. All this is expressed in few words by the Apostle: Rom. 3. 4. *God is tru; & every man a lyar.*

Both Phylosophers, & Divines enquire, whither the same thing can be the object of *Faith*, & *Senses*, can be seene & beleived? & commonly they conclude that it is impossible. At least this seemes vndoubted of, that, *De facto*, it is not soe.

For the Apostle says, that Faith is *An evidence of things not seene.* Heb. 11. 1. & S. *Austin*, tr. 68. & 79. in Ioan. *Quidest fides? Credere quod non vides. Faith is a Beleife of things, which we do not see.* So that *Senses* are so far from being the *Objectum formale*, the motiue of our Faith, that it doth not at all depend on them.

4. The Apostles, being witnesses of the greatest & most important truths, that can be, were care full to perswade their Auditory, 1. that they vnderstood very well the things they preacht: & 2. that they did not alter any thing in the delivery of it. And because Eye witnesses are commonly more assured, than others, they mention that 1. cor. 15. 8. *He was seene of me.* 2. Pet. 1. 16. *We haue not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made knowne vnto you, the power, & coming of our Lord Iesus-Christ; but were eye witnesses of his Majesty, --- ---. This voice, which came from Heauen we heard,*

when we were with him in the holy mount. Here are two *Senses* alleadged, *Seing* & *Hearing*. And the beloved Disciple 1. 30 1. 1. & 3. *Which we haue heard, which we haue seene with our eyes, which we haue looked vpon, & our hands haue handled of the word of life. --- --- That which we haue seene, & heard, declare we that vnto you.* And S. *Peter* being to choose a successor to *Iudas*, required the choice should be made amongst those, who from the Baptisme till the Ascension adhered to *Christ*. Act. 1. 21. 22. *Of these men, which haue companyed with vs, all the time, that our Lord Iesus went in & out amongst vs, beginning from the Baptisme of Iohn, vnto that same day, that he was taken vp from vs, must one be ordained to be a witnesse with vs of his Resurrection.* And *Nicodemus* doubting of something, which our saviour had told him, Christ for confirmation of what he sayd, alleadged the like motiue: Joan. 3. 11. *We speake, what we know, & testify what we haue* seene. And S. Luke in the Preface to his ghospel, assures, he writes, what he received from those, who *From the beginning were eye witnesses, & ministers of the word, & having a perfect vnderstanding of things*, &c.

Whence is evident, that all that mention of the senses doth not proue, that Faith hath any dependance at all on them; being only alleadged to make the Preachers of the Ghospel more creditable. But the only tru motiue of our Faith, is the *Veracity of God*: the Preachers of the Ghospel not delivering their owne word; but the word of God: & the Hearers *Receiving it not as the word of men; but as it is truly, the word of God.* 1. Thes. 2. 13. This as to the first qualification of a witnesse.

As to the second, that *They would not deceiue others*, was evident from the whole life of the Apostles, free from levity, from vanity, from selfe interest, &c. & all these strengthned by several other circumstances, whereof each one severally taken had some force; but taken altogether, they convinced all considering men, that it was more them morally impossible, that men so qualifyed, should wittingly tell a lye, or deceiue willingly their Auditory. All which things

things are hinted at in those words: 1. Thes. 1. 5. *Our Ghospel came not vnto you in word only; but also in Power, & in the Holy Ghost, & in much assurance (fullnesse) as ye know WHAT MANNER OF MEN WE WERE amongst you for your sakes QVALES FVERIMVS IN VOBIS PROPTER VOS.* And 1. cor. 2. 4. *My speech, & my preaching was not with entising words of men's wisdome; but in demonstration of the spirit, & of Power.* Altho it doth not sufficiently appeare, whither the words themselues contained that manifestation of the spirit, or the Person, who spoke, or both.

5. All this was confirmed by *Miracles*, which may properly enough be called the *Broade seale* of the King of Kings: for as a *Broade seale* is a publicke Attestation of the Truth of a Patent, or Proclamation, to which it is annext, solikewise a miracle is an Attestation of Almyghty God of a Truth delivered in his name. *Divina potentia etiam factis loquitur*, says S. *Austin*, Epist. 49. 9. 6 *Men speake by words; God also by deedes.* And Origen contra Celsum l. 2. says the same. This language of God by miracles, is soo cleere, that even the most stupid vnderstand it; & yet so hard, that none can speake it, but he, who is Almyghty. Hence Mar. 16 God is sayd *To haue confirmed the words with the signes following it.* And Heb. 24. *To haue borne witnesse with signes, & wonders, & divers miracles, & gifts of the Holy Ghost.* So when *Christ* our Lord Mat. 9. 6. sayd: *That ye may know, that the son of man hath Power on Earth to forgiue sins he sayd to the sick of the Palsye: Arise take vp thy bed, & goe vnto thy house*: it was to call God to witnesse that Truth, that he had such a Power: And God by doing the miracle did virtually say. *I attest, that he hath such a Power.* And who, seing this, could doubt whither *Christ* had such a Power, without doubting of the divine veracity?

Yet we must not hence inferre, that *Miracles* are the formal object of our *Faith*. For as the only motiue, why a Proclamation is obeyed, is nothing else, but the King's will commanding: & the *Broade seale* serues only to assure vs, that is the King's deede. Soe the

the sole motiue of our Faith is divine veracity authorizing what that man, S. *Paul*, for example, preached; & the miracle confirmes vs in the perswasion, that man delivers divine Truth.

SECTION VIII.

1. 3. *Faith by Hearing.*

2. *Words are the best of signes.*

4. *Scripture the object of Hearing.*

Where of the invention of writing.

1. THe Doctor of the gentils, who laboured with greater successe in conversions, than all the other Apostles, seemes in a particular manner to speake of the *Hearing*, as conducing to the propagation of *Faith* in a singular way. His words are these: Rom. 10. a versu 14. *How shall they call on him, in whome they haue not beleived? & how shall they beleiue in him, of whome they haue not heard? & how shall they heare without a Preacher? And how shall they preach, except they besent?* And concludes, *so then Faith comes by Hearing, & hearing by the word of God.* Which words confound all enthusiasts, & others who vndertake to preach, without being lawfully called, or sent by the Holy Ghost. But our present businesse is to examin, why *Faith* is so particulary resolved into *Hearing*. Nothing like this being any where sayd of any other *Sense.*

2. This will be easily vnderstood, if we remember, that, as is aboue-sayd, Faith is an Assent giuen to an otherwise vnknowne Truth on the credit of another. This cannot be done, without the others thought be made knowne to me: to effect this some outward signes must be vsed: for men cannot speake to, nor heare one another, as *Angels* do, by an immediate communication of thoughts; but

but are forced to make vſe of outward ſignes, to which ſome ſignification knowne to both partyes, is annext. Now of all ſignes, none more eaſy, or ſignificant, than articulate words, which with their ſignification are by the *Hearing* conveyghed to the mind of the Hearer: who by that meanes comes to know what the other averres, & giues his Aſſent to it. And ſo Faith comes by *Hearing*.

Yet becauſe there are other ways to communicate our Thoughts, particularly by the eyes, *Hearing* may be thought, not to be the only way to beget Faith. Men may ſpeake to the eyes, by geſtures, or motions of Head, Hand, or other parts of the Body, if ſome meaning be annext to them. And in this ſort of language the ancient *Mimi Greekes*, & Romans were excellent. Now that mute way of ſpeaking, by geſtures of the Body to the eyes, is much out of vſe, & almoſt forgotten. As to other ſenſes, they can reckon but very few ſignificant ſignes: ſo Hearing ſurpaſſes all ſenſes in this, by reaſon of articulate ſounds, which it receiues, & paſſes to the mind. Which I learne from S. *Auſtin* l. 2. *de Doctrinâ Chriſtianâ*, Cap. 3. *Tuba, & Tibia & Cythara, dant non ſolum ſuavem; ſed etiam ſignificantem ſonum. Sed omnia ſigna verbis comparata, pauciſſima ſunt. Verba enim inter homines obtinuerunt principatum ſignificandi, quacumque animo concipiuntur, ſi ea prodere quiſque velit. Several muſical inſtruments giue not only a ſweete; but alſo a ſignificatiue ſound. But words are the Princes of all ſignes, as well for their number & variety, as for their efficacy in ſignifying.*

Suppoſe I know a Truth, vnknowne to another, & would bring him to beleiue it, how muſt I do this? 1. I chooſe words proper to ſignify my mind, to him. 2. I vtter thoſe words, 3. he heares them, & 4. beleiues the thing to be as I ſayd, becauſe he is perſwaded, I am not deceived, nor would deceiue him. Thus is propagated *Humane Faith*. Now to *Divine*.

That God can ſpeake without vſing any words, to the mind immediatly, is an vndoubted Truth, ſeing the greateſt part, if not all Revelations were originally made in that nature, to ſome one Perſon, who

who knew certainly not only what was ſayd; bnt that it was God, who ſpoke it. But whither this *Evidentia rei atteſtante Deo*, this cleere knowledge of God affirming it, is conſiſtent with Faith, or transferres that knowledge to another ſpecies of ſcience, Viſion

Theiologi certant, & adhuc ſub judice lis eſt.

But this is certaine 1. That it is not neceſſary to *Faith*, otherwiſe the miſſion of Preachers would be ſuperfluous. 2 That God did not vſe it to all men, to exclude pretences to Enthuſiaſmes of Fanaticks & prevent the jlluſions of the devil. 3. That God ſeemes in propagating his Faith to accommodate himſelf to the ordinary way of men. A King ſends his Embaſſadors, whither he goes not in perſon, with jnſtructions what to ſay, & credentialls to procure beleiſe to what they ſay: & their words are looked on as the words of the King their maſter. So God ſends the Apoſtles as his Embaſſadors (2. cor. 5. 20) he giues them their inſtructions, to teach what they had learnt of him, & for their credentials, he gaue them Power ts worke miracles. Hence *The words they ſpoke, were not received as the words of men; but as they truly were the words of God.* 1. Theſ. 2. 13. And the *Faith* giuen to their words, was *Divine Faith.*

3. That this was, & is, & to the end of the wold will be, the ordinary way, of conveyghing *Faith*, is evident. 1. Becauſe the Apoſtles propoſition *Faith comes by Hearing*, is vniverſal, & vnlimited to any time, or place. 2. God ſent his Apoſtles & Diſciples to Preach the Ghoſpel, without any expreſſe command to vſe other ſignes, or write bookes: & indeed moſt of thoſe written, were caſual. 3. The Apoſtles ſent their ſucceſſours on alike errant, & with alike Commiſſion: & we find in S. *Irenæus*, that Faith was long preſerved in ſome countryes, without any written word. 4. *Faith* (by the Apoſtle called milke) is ſtill by Parents, Nurſes, & ſuch perſons inſtilled into the *Tender minds* of Infants, even before they are able to reade. And if they conceiue it ryghtly, & beleiue it ſtrongly, they haue tru divine Faith. 5. The ſame of ſeveral Perſons at men's eſtate, who for Poverty, or other employments, cannot reade the ſcriptures.

4. ſerip-

4. *Scripture* may seeme an exception from that general rule, *Faith by Hearing*; but it is not so, *Scripture* it selfe being only an jmage of what is spoken, & therefore belongs to the same *Sense*, that words do. Hence S. *Austin* l. 2. de Doct. Christ. c. 4. *Quia verberato aere statim transeunt verba, nec diutius manent, quam sonant, instituta sunt per litteras signa verborum, ita voces ostenduntur non per seipsas; sed per signa quædam sua. By reason that after a little motion of ayre, the voice presently vanishs, & is assoone lost as the sound is past, Letters were invented, as signes of words, by which meanes words are shewed, not by themselues; but by their signes.* Thus S. *Austin.* Which was elegantly exprest by a French Poet *Brebeuf en sa Pharsale*:

C'est de là que nous vient cet art ingenieux,
De peindre la parole, & de parler aux yeux
Et par les traits divers des figures tracées,
Donner de la couleur, & du corps aux pensées,
Hence that ingenious art did first arise,
Of painting words, & speaking to our eyes:
Where with the pen doth by mysterious draught
Both colour giue, & Body to a thought.

J doe not cite this, as building my assertion vpon it; but as a neate expression of what I meane. The ground, on which J rely is scripture, whereof a greate part is evidently a description of speeches. For 1. a greate part of the *Ghospel* is a Relation of our saviours Admonitions, Sermons, Reprehensions, Justructions, &c. 2. The *Acts of the Apostles* containe their speeches. 3. the *Apocalypse* is a representation of visions, & Prophecyes revealed to S *Iohn.* 4. S. *Luke* in his preface, declares that he writes what he had *Heard* 5. S. *Mark* writ what S. *Peter* preacht. *Marcus Discipulus, & Interpres Petri*, says S. *Hierome, juxta quod Petrum referentem audierat, rogatus Romæ a Fratribus breve scripsit Evangelium Mark the Disciple & Interpreter of Peter at the request of the Brethren in Rome, writ in a short Ghospel, what he had heard Peter preach.*

My last, & cheifest proofe, is from the words of *Abraham* to the

glutton, Luck. 16. 29. *They* (thy Brothers) *haue moyses, & the Prophets, let them heare them.* Et verse 31. *If they heare not Moyses & the Prophets, nether will they be perswaded, though one rise from the dead.* Here those are sayd to haue *Moses*, & the *Prophets*, who haue their writings. 2. *Moses* & the *Prophets* are sayd to *Speake* in their writings, seing others are sayd to *Heare* them.

Hence I conclude, that the jnstruction we receiue from *Scripture* it selfe, is reduced to *Hearing*.

SECTION IX.

1. *All* Senses *never contrary to Faith.*
2. *Hearing is to correct the other senses.*
3. *A conclusion of this digression.*

THe two first points are cheifely aimed at, in all this Preface, & will serue to cleere the mist which Humane Reason casts before our eyes, that we may not discerne Truth from falshood, but may embrace a Cloud, for *Iuno*; & leaue the substance for a shaddow.

Thô some *Senses* may, yet all can never be contrary to *Faith* this is my first conclusion The reason is, Faith must be conveyghed into our mind by some *Sense*: wherefore that *Sense*, at least, is not contrary to *Faith*. Which is evident by the ordinary course of Providence teaching vs by *Hearing*, *Preachers*, *Missions*, &c. Of which S. *Paul*. Rom. 10. Now if God doth at any time by particular inspiration instruct some, that is nothing against this Truth, seing those thoughes so inspired are conformable to what others *Heare*: & by consequence not contrary to all *Senses*.

2. My second Conclusion is: in matter of *Faith*, *Hearing* is preferred before all other *Senses*. The 1. reason, is, because *Hearing* is more

is more capable of conveyghing revealed Truths, than any other *Sense*, nay than all the rest together, it having more significant signes, then all the rest together, as is evident, by the multitude of significant words.

The second reason is because God doth actually vse *Hearing*, & no other *Sense*, to communicate to vs his *Faith*: For our whole Duty to God, & our neyghbour, what we are bonnd to beleiue, & practice, is all delivered ether by living words, in Catechisms & Sermons: or in Bookes, by dead representations of those living words.

Wherefore when senses interfere in their depositions concerning any object of *Faith*, we must recurre to *Hearing*, & adhere to that. For example: Other *Senses* represent *Christ* to vs, as an ordinary man; *Hearing* says, he is *The only begotten son of God, full of grace, & Truth*: we must beleiue this, & silence the rest. The rest say water only washes from dirt the surface of the Body; this says, it purges the soul from the staine of sin: we must beleiue this. Why then should not this rule, acknowledged by the *Zuinglians* in other things to be good, hold in the Blessed *Eucharist*? So that althô the tast tell vs it is bread, & wine, we may subscribe to our *Hearing*, with S. *Cyril* nay with the whole *Church*, & say *It is the Body, & Bloud of Christ*?

But what if *Reason* takes the part of the other *Senses*? Answer I will say still, we must stick however to *Hearing*. For example: Reason says, the same substance cannot be *One* & three; *Hearing* says, the same Divine substance is one in nature, & three in Persons: Our duty is to beleiue God to be so: & to silence all reasons to the contrary: This is what S. *Paul* vnderstood, by *Pulling downe imaginations, & every thought contrary to his* Doctrine: & *bringing vnderstandings vnder the subjection of Christ*

I haue here delivered, as by a digression, such grounds, as if well vsed, will be sufficient to resist all the Attacks of God, & his spouses enemys. Yet they are soe cleere, that J think few can deny them,

without rejecting *Christianity* in some very material points. Yet I haue not wandred, in this digression, out of the syght, of my learned freind, D. *Morley*: if he retaines his treatise in his company in passing over these few sections, he will easily obserue, there is nothing, but which relates to it. J now returne to him the liberty to propose his Argument, & am ready to heare him.

SECTION X.

1. *The Catholick Doctrine of Transubstantiation.*

2. *D Morley's argument against it returned vpon him.*

4. *Nether scripture nor Church prejudiced by our Doctrine*

4. *Nor senses.*

1. D. Morley. *The Doctrine of* Transubstantiation, *Or the* Church of Rome's *Interpretation of those words*, This is my Body, *Is, that in Sacrament of the Altar, the whole substance of Bread is changed into the Body, & the whole substance of Wine into the Bloud of Christ: so that after Consecration there Remains nether Bread, nor Wine; but only the Body, & Bloud of* Christ *vnder the species, or accidents of Bread, & Wine.*

Revisor. Why you should say it is the sentiment of the *Church of Rome* particularly, when it is common to all other *Oriental Christians*, is not hard to guesse at: you would insinuate, what you dare not speake out (it is so evidently false) that she [the Ch. of R.] stands alone in this point of Doctrine, whereas all other *Christian Churchs* extant when your Reformation began agreed in substance with that of Rome, their mother, in this point. But let that passe. J acknowledge that you represent our sentiment ryght. What haue you to say against it?

2. D.

2. D. Morley: *Against this Position I argue thus: that which frustrates all the vse, & end of scripture, cannot be the tru interpretation of any one place of it. But that interpretation of those words of scripture, frustrates all the end, & vse of scripture. Therefore the Ch. of* Romes *interpretation of this place of scripture cannot be tru.*

I proue the minor, or second proposition thus: that which necessarily implyes our Senses *are, or may be deceived in their proper objects so that what all men's* Senses *represent as one thing, may be, & is indeed another, must needes frustrate all the end, & vse of all scripture. But that interpretation doth necessarily imply, that our senses may be, & are deceived in their proper objects, by teaching that to be Flesh, & Bloud which to all men's* Senses *appeares to be Bread, & Wine. Therefore our interpretation of those words doth frustrate, the vse, & end of all scriptures.*

Revisor. I deny the minor, or second Proposition of your first *syllogisme.* To the proofe of it, 1. I will let the maior, or first Proposition, passe, althô it be not tru: for mine, & all men's senses in the world represent the moone bigger in the east, & west, then in the south, which is evidently false: & yet the *Scripture* is not *Frustrated* by that Epidemical errour of all men's *Senses.* Our *Reason*, is superiour to *Senses*, & doth correct that errour, without prejudicing *Scripture* by it: & why may not *Faith* which is superiour to both *Sense* & *Reason*, correct both, when they go astray; & yet *Scripture* remaine entire, seing Faith is but the Doctrine of *Sripture*, & as it were its soul? Yet I will *Gratis* admit your *Maior.*

2. I deny your minor, or second Proposition; for it appeares to no man's *Hearing*, to be *Bread*, & *Wine*; but *Flesh*, & *Bloud. This is my Body: this is my Bloud*, are the expresse words of *Christ*: now, sir, you know out of the Apostle (I haue minded you of it) that *Faith comes by Hearing.* And *Hearing* is not mistaken, in this matter. Hence S. *Thomas of Aquin.*

Visus, Tactus, Gustus in te fallitur:
Sed auditu solo tuto creditur.
Credo quidquid dixit Dei Filius:
Nihil hoc verbo veritatis verius.

We

We acknowledg that *Sight*, *Feeling*, & *Tast* are mistaken here: & we correct their mistake by the expresse word of God, by *Hearing* conveyghed to our minds; to which word, we owe greater obedience, than to all our *Senses* together. So your minor is false.

Thus your Conclusion, that *Our interpretation doth frustrate, & make voyde the end, & vse of scripture*, that came limping in on two bullrushes for crutches, fals to the ground, one of them being broken, & the other insufficient, to beare such a weyght.

2. Now I desire you to shew your skill in sophistry, & answer this syllogisme, by which I draw the same Conclusion, out of your Doctrine, & exposition of *Christ's* words: That interpretation which is plainely contradictory to the expresse words of *Scripture*, doth frustrate the end, & vse of *Scripture*, But such is your interpretation of those words of *Christ*. Therefore your interpretation frustrates the end, & vse of *Scripture*.

The maior, or first Proposition is evident: for what vse can be made of *Scripture*, to what intent can it serve, if we take the liberty to beleiue & teach the direct contrary Doctrine, to what it delivers. For example, if when the scripture says: *God Created Heauen*, & *Earth*: we say *God did not create Heauen & Earth*. When it says: *The word was in the beginning*. We say, *The word was not in the beginning*. When it says: *The word was made Flesh*; we say: *The word was not made Flesh*. And so of the rest. What can *Scripture* signify, to what vse, to what intent can it serue, when such interpretations are made of it? Soe my maior stands good.

The minor, 2. Proposition is evident, that *Such is your interpretation of Christ's words*. For *Scripture* says; *That is Christ's Body*, you say: *That is not Christ's Body*. *Scripture* says: *That is Christ's Bloud*; you say, *That is not Christ's Bloud*. Let those frame an interpretation more opposit to *Scripture* who can: I confesse my skil in Logicke reachs not to frame any more directly opposite. I feare you will find it as much harder to answer this Argument, than I shall to answer yours, as it is to cure a real, than to cure afeigned sicknesse.

D. Mor-

4. D Morley: p. 4. *All scripture being written for our learning*, as S. Paul *Says it is, there being no other meanes, whereby we can come to know what is written in* Scripture, *but our* Senses, *either* reading it our *Selues, or hearing it read: if I be not certain of what I* see, *when I reade my selfe, nor of what I* heare, *when I am read to by others, it is impossible for me to know what the* Scripture *teacheth: & by consequence the* Scripture *it self must* be *vseleſſe, or to no purpose.* Thus you.

Here *Goliath* like you bring a sword to cut off your owne head. We say the words of *Scripture* are cleere, that whither we *Reade*, or *Heare* them, they signify the same thing, & we vnderstand them in their plaine, & obvious sense, as any man would vnderstand them, who is resolved to submit his reason to them which we doe; & not make them stoop to some of our fleshly *Senses*, as you doe. Wherefore your method & interpretation frustrates all vse of *Scripture*: ours leaues it in its full force & vigour. You make *Scripture* weare the chaines of *Senses*; we bind senses, & Reason too, to the triumphant chariot of *Scripture.*

Then you discover an vnexpected concerne for the *Church Authority* [after having spent your whole life in fyghting against it] as if that were prejudiced by our Doctrine. *Not only the scripture*, say you, *But the Church it selfe also must needes be vseleſſe: because the Ch. as well the scripture teaches vs by no other* medium, *But that of our senses.* Here is matter indeed for lamentation, tho you shew no greate signe of real greife. But God be prayſed, the Church is not brought so low, as to want your helpe. Her Authority is not prejudiced by such, as with Humility receiue her Doctrine; but by such, as with Pride reject it, by *Protestants*, who impugne the sense she received, with the words, from her spouse, & his faithfull interpreters, the Apostles.

D. M. p. 5. *If I be not certaine, that what I see, & feele, & tast, & smell to be bread, & wine, is bread & wine, but something else: by the same reason I cannot be certain that these words, this is my body, whither I see them written, or heare them spoken, be indeed those words;* & not

& not *some other words of a different, or contrary signification.*

Revisor. You still go on in a false supposition, that we *Cartesian* like deny all credit to *Senses*. This is absolutely false: for we giue credit to our *Senses*, thô not so greate as to Eternal Truth Nether do we doubt of that thing being bread, & wine, which to *Senses* seemes such, except only when God himself tells vs *It is his Body.* Here then is our case. A thing is placed on an Altar, that *Lookes*, *feeles*, *tasts*, & *smells* like *Breade.* What is that thing? God tells me, in the Eare, *It is his Body*: our *Senses* tell me, *It is Bread.* Whither of these depositions shall I beleiue? That of *Senses*, say you: that of God, says the *Church*, seing it is not impossible our *Senses* should be mistaken; but it is absolntely impossible, that God should tell *Alye.* But, say you *If we doubt of those sensations of bread, we may doubt of those of the words, whither we reade or heare them.* Answer. Till you shall shew me, by an Authority greater then that of God himself, those words, are something else, I will beleiue them to be those words. As I beleiue that to be *Bread*, which seemes such, vnlesse where God tells me the contrary. Do I passe thorough a market, by a Bakers shop, come into adining toome, we giue as full credit to our *Senses*, as you, & judg that to be *Bread*, which seemes *Bread*: only on the Altar, after Consecration we say it is *the Body* of *Christ*, because *Christ* says it is such, & the Church always vnderstood those words, as we doe.

Then you learnedly discourse of *Outward signes, & inward invisible grace: Of the Trumpet*, & *its sounding: of men preparing to battle*, God blesse vs, of *Dreames*, *visions*, *inspirations*, & what not. From which if you can conclude any thing against vs, I will beare your chaines. These rambling phancys are extraordinary in one of your age: I wish you to take heede, your pen goe not faster than your head, as it seemes to doe, when you cite those words, as of S. *Austin*: *Quod non lego, non credo: What I read not, I beleiue not:* which make against you: for *We read, what we* beleiue, that it is *Christ's Body*; but we do not read: *It is not Christ's Body*, nor: *It is*

Bread

Bread: which is what you beleiue.

D. M. p. 7. *If there be a certainty in the sense of* Hearing, *there must be in that of* seing.

Revisor. I admit an equal certainty in both, taken by themselues; yet *Hearing*, when announcing what God says, surpasses *Sight*, & all the rest; for we are to strike to Faith, & God's Truth; not to any else.

D. M. p. 8. & 9. *If there be no certainty of* Senses, *in one thing, there is none in any thing, vnlesse I know certainly what that one thing is; & nothing can secure me, vnlesse* Christ *in expresse words tell vs*: Beleiue your *Senses* in all things else, but only in the *Sacrament.*

Revisor. Whence so greate a concerne for the Authority of *Senses*, & so little for that of the *Church*? All is vndone, if the *Senses* be corrected by the expresse words of *Christ*, whome they contradict, no hurt done, thô the *Church* be charged with errour, even when she follows the words of *Christ*! yet by the *Church* we receiue the word of God, & its meaning too. Now why is an errour charged on *Senses*, of so pernicious a nature, as to destroy all their credit, vnlesse *Christ's* expresse words are produced to vouch it in all other things: & one, nay many errours, charged on the Church, by which we receiue Faith, & no hurt done? Is not *Faith* handed to vs by the *Church* of as greate consequence, as that little scantling of Knowledge, which we receiue from our *Senses*?

But why is an errour of *Senses* so fatal to their credit? Haue they never deceived you, or at least some others, of your acquaintance? & do you therefore renounce them? Haue not some men, their eyes only representing a greene medow, fallen into a quack-mire? & do you for that reason either pull out your eyes, as vseless, or shut them, as deceivable when you walke? Are these Arguments of such strength, as to beate downe the expresse words of *Christ*, & Doctrine of the whole *Church*? what times do we liue in, to what passe is *Christianity* brought, when a *Doctor of Divinity*, & a pretended *Bishop*, fyghts with such straws against *Christ's* words, & *Faith*!

Yet becauſe old age is apprehenſiue, J will giue you a remedy againſt this groundleſſe Feare. You require an exception in expreſſe words: J will giue you one, at leaſt *Æquivalentèr*: It is a general Rule *Exceptio in non exceptis firmat regulam. When an exception is made from a Rule, all things not expreſt in the exception, remaine vnder the Rule.* Wherefore *Chriſt* having excepted only the Bleſſed Sacrament from the Depoſition of *Senſes*, he left all other things ſubject to them. So, ſir, althô you hold with vs *Tranſubſtantiation*, when you ſee a floore, you may walke on it, without fearing a precipice: & when you ſee a Chaire, you may confidently ſit downe, without Fearing it should proue a Cobweb. Wherefore Cheere vp, deare ſir, you may be ſecure, thô *Chriſt* be beleived.

SECTION XI. OF MIRACLES.

1. *Whither all Miracles visible.*
2. *What Miracles are.*
3. *The final cauſe of Miraçles.*
4. *Accidents Changeable the ſubſtance remaining.*
5. *Dr. M.'s Paradoxes.*

1. D. M. p. 9. *Tis to little purpoſe, to tell vs, that this converſion of Bread into* Flesh, & wine *into* Bloud, *is miraculous, & therefore ſo monſtrous, as to be a contradiction to* Senſe. *Miracles are Appellations to* Senſe, & *the end of them is by the evidence of our* Senſe, *to convince our* Vnderſtanding *of ſome thing, which otherwiſe we would not, or could not haue beleived.*

Reviſor. You ſeeme reſolved to prevent our retreate, by ſtopping all ways imaginable to it: yet your main induſtry is to miſſe; not to hit, that which is moſt obvious: which I haue already taken, & expect

expect you, or any who takes vp the Cudgelles for you, in it. Yet I will in short review what you say of *Miracles.*

Miracles, when done in Confirmation of *Faith*, are designed to giue credit to a man, who speakes in God's name, & whome otherwise we should not beleiue. they are by a metaphore proper enough called *God's Broade-seale.* Now as a *Broad-seale* is indifferent to all deeds, & authenticates any, to which it is annext; so a *Miracle* myght confirme any Truth; but is determined by circumstances to some one, rather then others. For example the man sicke of the Palsy myght haue beene cured in Confirmation of the *Trinity*, or *Incarnation*; but was determined to testify that *Christ had power to remit* sins by those words, *That you may know that the son of man hath Power to forgiue sins, then he sayd* &c.

2. I say when *Miracles are done in Confirmation of Faith*, for all *Miracles* are not done for that end. A *Miracle*, is *an effect of God's Power acting contrary to second causes. Natural effects* are conformable to their inclinations, as that fire heates. *Supernatural* are aboue them: as that water justifyes the soul. *Preternatural* are besides them, as motion of parts of water within themselues. *Miraculous* or *contranatural*, are contrary to them. Such was the cure of *Ezechias*, & rayfing of *Lazarus*; for second causes required the death of the first, & the corruption of the second. Soe S. *Austin* l. 26. *Cont. Faustum*, c. 3. *Cum Deus aliquid facit contra cognitum nobis cursum solitumque naturæ, magnalia, vel mirabilia nominantur. When God doth any thing against, or contrary to, the knowne, & vsual course of nature, we call that thing a* miracle. Wherefore when S. *Thomas* & some other Divines say *Miracles* are *Præter, besides* the course of nature, they are to be vnderstood, as I sayd; & *Præter* in them is equivalent to *Contra.*

That no *Miracles* are done, but visible, & in publick, you say, but can never proue, because it is false. S. *Austin* proues this, Epist. 3. ad *Volusianum*, by Christ's coming into the world without violating the virginity of his Blessed mother: & his coming out of his sepulcher, this remaming shut. See S. *Thomas.* 3. p. q. 29. a. 1. ad 2. Of

which more hereafter, S. 14. Indeed were no miracles done in private, it were in vaine, for men in deserts, to implore God's assistance against a Lyon, or serpent, which would devoure or sting them. But the contrary errour of Protestants in *Brevint*, *Burnet*, & *Morley*, is grounded on another erroneous opinion, that no *Miracles* are done, but in Confirmation of Faith. Whereas it is certaine they are done for other intentions. For

3. Whatsoever can moue God to vse his absolute Power in thwarting the ordinary course of *Nature*, may be the *Final cause* of a *Miracle*. *Pharaoth* refusing to dismisse the *Israelits*, *Miracles* were done to shew it was God's will they should be dismist. Exo. 7. A doubt being raysed whither the Preisthood were to be confined to *Aaron's* family, God decided it by the miraculous budding of his rod. numb. 17. 3. *Gedeon* wanting resolution to vndertake the war against the *Madianits*, was encouraged by the dew on his furre. Iud. 6. 4. The encrease of Oyle, to releiue a poore widow distressed by her creditours. 4. (2.) Reg. 4. 5. Waters causing a curse, to ease a husband of his Jealousy. numb. 5. 6. That there were no ill smells in the Temple, notwithstanding all the *Burnt offrings*, nor flyes, where so much bloud was spilt, was in respect to that Holy place. The cure of *Ezechias*, for his comfort, or the good of the Royal family, which wanted an heyre. And who can tell how many other even private things may haue moved Almyghty God, to dispense in the common law of nature, & act contrary to second causes? How often, are miracles done in consequence of that prayer of the *Church*, *Ad te nostras etiam rebelles compelle propitius voluntates*, drawing those to a pious life, who had a perfect aversion to it? This you will say is no *Miracle*. But S. *Anselme* says it is, & S. *Thomas*, 1. 2. q. 113. a. 10. & reason proues it to be such, because it is contrary to the inclination of the will, *Antecedenter*, thô *Consequenter* the will consents, being brought ouer strongly, thô sweetely by the Grace of God. And without all doubt, on *The greate day*, we shall see an infinit number of other Accidents, wholy miraculous, done either for the spiritual,

ſpiritual, or temporal good of both private, & publicke perſons: which are at preſent entirely hidden from the eyes of all men, even thoſe in whoſe favour they are done.

Whence I inferre, that this converſion in the B. Sacrament, may be *Miraculous*, & yet be obſervable by no *Senſes*.

4. D. M. pag. 10. Moſes his *Rod turned into a ſerpent, ceaſed to looke like a rod, & in all things was like a ſerpent, which the Magicians rods (which were not turned into ſerpents) did not, & water turned into wine, ceaſed to taſt or ſmell like water.* Therefore all Miracles are perceptible to ſenſe.

Reviſor. A falſe illation out of an inſufficient induction, as if I should conclude, that all men walke, becauſe *Peter* & *Paul* walke,

D. M. pag. 10. *There cannot be a change of one thing into another, without a mutual change of Accidents, as well as of ſubſtance: becauſe every thing conſiſts, & is made vp of Accidents, as well as of ſubſtance.*

Rev. What ſtuffe is this! I perceiue your *Metaphyſicks* are equal to your *Divinity. Every thing conſiſts of, & is made vp of Accidents, as well as of ſubſtance*! I hope you will ſay a man is made vp of his cloths too. And not be much out of the way, if you ſpeake of thoſe of your degree, who are compounded of lawne ſleeues, &c. in lieu of the interiour character. How groſſely are ſilly Phyloſophers miſtaken, when they define *Accidents*, by their ſeparability from *ſubſtance*, without its decay! *Quod adeſt, & abeſt ſine ſubjecti interitu*! what, cannot a man become swarthy, by being expoſed to the ſun in the ſummer, or cold in the winter, but his *Subſtance*, his *Body*, or *ſoul* muſt be changed? Excellent Doctrine! And very fit to make vs fall out with *Tranſubſtantiation*!

As vnexpected is that other ſaying: *There cannot be a change of one thing into another, without a mutuall change of Accidents, as well as of ſubſtance. Vnexpected*, I ſay, from ſo learned a perſon; it being ſo far from Truth & ſo contrary to experience, that to confute it nothing is neceſſary, but to shew you any newly dead Corps, of one knowne to you before. Is there no change *In ſubſtance*, when the

the soul is separated from the Body? And do not many Accidents remaine, so as it seemes rather a sleepe, then dead? Do not beleiue me, beleiue your owne eyes, for which you pleade so earnestly: Is there not the same quantity? The same situation of patts? The same organization? The same colour, moles, warts, skars, &c. as before? How then can you say, *There is no change in substance*, without one in *Accidents* too? Do you not see, that by pleading for *Sense*, against *Faith*, you endanger the losse of both? And of your *Reason* too: giving me here a reason against your self: For if *Accidents* remaine, when the man is no more (as certainly he is not, when his soul is departed) why may not the *Accidents* of *Bread* remaine, when the *Bread* is no more?

D. M. *If there could be a substance without its owne Accidents, or Accidents without their owne substance, yet no man can be obliged to beleiue there was one without the other, because it is not possible to judge of one but by the other.*

Rev. All men are obliged to beleiue, what God reveales. So if God reveales that the substance is changed, althô the Accidents remaine, we are to beleiue the *Change*. But, say you, *We cannot judge of one, but by the other.* Why not, good sir, if God speakes? Can we not as assuredly ground a judgment vpon his word, as vpon any *Sense*, nay all the *Senses* together?

5. Having thus reviewed the grounds of your judgment, in this place, let vs score vp some Paradoxes of yours

1. *Miracles* are *Appellations to* sense. What *Sense* did Christ appeale to, when Luk. 4. 30 *He past through the midst of a multitude of men, & went his way*? To what sense doth he appeale, when he converts a sinner?

2. Miracles *Are done to convince our understanding of a Truth.* I challenge any man to shew in scripture any proofe of this saying, taken generally. Many Miracles are private, done for the releife of private Persons. Doth not the *Church* teach vs to haue recourse, to God by Prayer, in personal wants? And why so, if God on such occasions

occasions never acts contrary to second causes ?

3. *The Magicians rods were not turned into serpents.* It is expressely sayd Ex. 7. 12. Their rods *Became serpents.* I know Fathers are divided in this point. But why you should take to that opinion, which seemingly contradicts scripture, I know not, vnlesse it be your custome to regard it little. But if they remained rods, how had they the *Appearance*, or *Accidents* of *Serpents*, & were by the spectators judged to be such? Sure you may as well beleiue there may be the *Accidents* of *Bread*, without its substance, as the *Accidents* of *Serpents*, where there never were any serpents. Againe how could *Moses* Rod made a serpent devour the rest, if they remained staues, is not easy to vnderstand. That one serpent should swallow another, is no greate wonder, we dayly see the Dams swallow their young ones, vpon approach of danger, & their limber yeilding bodys are fitted for it. But a strong staffe is not so pliable.

4. *All things consist of, & are made vp of Accidents as well as of substance.* So that *Accidents* are essential to man, & to other things: otherwise they would not make him vp, as *Well* as *Substance*, this being *Essential.*

Thus far we haue examined the proofe of your maior. Now comes your minor. We will see how that succeedes.

SECTION XII.

1. *What is the object of sense ?*
2. *Whither senses about it do discerne of their objects? & in it are mistaken ?*
3. *Of the conditions requisit to certify our senses ?*

1. D. D. M. p. 11. *If Papists say the proper objects of* Senses *are not the* Substances; *but* Accidents, *of things. I answer that though indeed the* Objectum formale, *or* Objectum quo *of the sense are* Accidents; *yet* Substances *are the* Objectum materiale, *or the*

or the Objectum quod, *even of our outward senses. My meaning is, that though* Senses *do discerne immediately of* Accidents, *onely, yet mediatly, & by* Accidents, *they discerne of substances also. So that nether* Accidents *alone, nor* Substance *alone; but the thing consisting of both, is the compleate, & adequate object of* Sense.

Revisor. This place seemes not so very proper, to procure by some shreds of *Latin*, & afew schoole termes, the repute of a Learned Clarck, when the same things myght as well haue been sayd in plaine English in the text, as in the margent, had you so thought it fitting. I will not imitate you. Though you cite as many schoole termes as are to be found in *Scotus*, & borrow hard words from *Arabick*, & *Hebrew*, as well as from *Latin*, you will never prove that my eye discernes the substance, as such. My eye represents a white object; but whither that white be in an egge, or in astone, or in some other substance, to that my eye says nothing. The same betwixt two egges: betwixt Chalke & Cheese, &c. And my eares tell me there is an Articulate sound: but what it meanes, my eare doth not tell. Or else we must say our eare is changed, as often, as we learne a new language. Thus the *Senses* only discover the *Colour*, or the thing *Coloured*, as it is such; & nofurther. The *Eye* sees white on a wall, discernes if it be pure or mingled with blacke, or red spots, cleere, or darkish. The *Eare heares* the voice, & discernes if it be musical, or not. The hand perceiues the object whither it be hard, or soft, rough, or smooth, warme, or cold: But to judge that the white is Plaster on a wall, the voice that of a man singing the prayses of God, the thing toucht, the hand of a freind, is the work of the vnderstanding, directed by *Senses*, but passing beyond them. For as the vnderstanding discovers the meaning of words, which the eare heares, & vnderstands not, & these two acts, thô as different as soul, & Body, are so linkt together, as they seeme the same Act: so it happens in other *Senses*, whose Actions haue such a connexion with those of the mind, which they stir vp, that they seeme but one, thô they really differ.

D. M.

2. D. M. p. 11. & 12. *If* Senses *doe not discerne of* Substances, *how could a man say he saw such a man*, or *heard such a story. Is not every* Substance *discernable by its proper* Accidents? *Why are our* Senses *giuen vs, if we cannot by them distinguish things themselues, as well as their* Accidents? *Wherefore did God giue vs several* Senses, *but onely for the better discerning of objects, that if one* Sense *faile, the others may supply?*

Revisor Here are four questions, all importing the same thing, & resolved with the same answer. Both you, & we agree, that it is convenient we haue some knowledge to discerne of objects. This you will haue to be the sole worke of the *Senses*. We say it is originally in the *Senses*, but it is compleated in, & by the *Vnderstanding*. Now to your four *Queres*.

To the first: we can say, we saw, & heard a story, because our *Vnderstanding* helped by senses judged so.

To the 2. By our vnderstanding we can discerne of *Objects*, & *substances*, by the meanes of *Senses*, which represent their *Accidents*.

To the 3. Our *Senses* are giuen vs, as servants to our *Vnderstanding*, & as its *Informers*..

To the 4. We haue several *Senses*, because there are several objects of *Senses*, & according to the species of objects, there ought to be divers *Senses*, as you may find in *Aristotle*, & other Philosophers.

D. M. p. 12. Isaac *Could not know his sons Esau*, *&* Jacob *from one another, by feeling* Iacob's *hands, being rough like those of* Esau, *but by hearing he myght distinguish them.*

Revisor. To what intent this is brought, is not easily discernable: that *Isaac* hearing *Iacob's* voice, surmised it to be like to that of *Iacob*, is very tru; but that he certainly knew him to be *Iacob*, is not certain: nay the astonishment, into which the tru *Esau* asking his Blessing cast him, is an evident signe, that till then he was not quite free from the errour, into which *Iacob's* goatish hands, & greasy clothes had brought him.

You seeme to think it necessary, that our *Senses* either severally,

 or at

or at least conjointly be able to discerne betwixt any two objects proposed. I think it were well, that they could do so; but do not beleiue, that any greate danger would hang over the world, if the *Senses* should be found insufficient sometimes. They are all together vnable to distinguish betwixt two glasses of water, two egges, two twins, a wolfe, & some dogs, &c. as hath beene often observed: yet the sun keepes on his course, & women bring forth at their ordinary time. *Pompey's* father was often taken for his Cooke *Monogenes*: *Pompey* himself could not be distinguisht from *Vibius*, & *Publitius*, both obscure men, & the later newly made free. *Cornelius Scipio* was often saluted by the name of *Serapio*, , a poore *Sexton*. These & other mistakes are recorded in *Valerius maximus* l. 9. c. 14. Yet that ignorance of the *Romans* did not ruin their state. Why then are you so solicitous to provide a Remedy against it? Or if a remedy be necessary, why may not our *Vnderstanding* act the *Apothecary* & provide it, as well as our *Senses*? Methinks it should rather belong to the vnderstanding, to compare several objects together, & state wherein the agree, & wherein they differ, then to the *Senses*. Otherwise we shall find it no easy matter, to fix the bounds betwixt these spiritual, & carnal facultyes: for you will adjudge to *Senses* what hath hitherto owned the jurisdiction of the *Vnderstanding*; & as to what will be left to this queene of our facultyes, our Reason, this shall onely be tenant at will to *Senses*, who by the same Topick may claime the rest & leaue the *Vnderstanding*, as the *Covenanters* left the *King*.

3. D. M. p. 14. & 15. Hath a long discourse about the conditions necessary to make vs infallibly certain of what we see. *Viz*,

1. *An eye well disposed.*
2. *The medium betwixt that, & the object as it ought to be.*
3. *The object at a convenient distance.*

These conditions being observed, the syght cannot be deceived in judging of colours, *or* coloratums, *as such.*

Revisor. I would not mingle in this place meere Phylosophical matter

matter with the reſt, if poſſible : ſo J paſſe by theſe conditions, onely propoſing ſome queſtions.

1. what certainty haue we, that there are no more ways to deceiue our *Sight*, than theſe conditions provide againſt ? Cannot ſwiftneſſe, or ſlowneſſe of motions alter the appearance, of *Colours*, & coloratums? Are there not ſome *Colours* various, according to the ſituation of the ſilkes, that for example, which the french call *Du Diable coeffé*, ſomething of the nature, of a doves necke? Do not *Mountebanks* find meanes to deceiue the eyes of their ſpectators, thô their eyes be good, the *Medium*, & diſtance competent ?

2. What certainty haue we, thoſe three condition be exactly obſerved? As to the firſt: may not our eyes be defectiue, & we not perceiue it? Doth not *Seneca* write of an old woman, who complained of all roomes being obſcure, yet never would acknowledge any fault in her eyes, which were the only faulty ?

As to the ſecond, may there not be a conſiderable difference in the *Medium*, enough to Refract the *Visual rays*, & we not perceive it?

As to the third, what certainty haue we, that the object is at a competent diſtance ? Do we certainly know what is the exacteſt diſtance? Do not painters direct vs, who are vnskilled in that Art, what is the proper *Diſtance* to ſee a Picture? And in how many other things may the diſtance proper for ſuch a determinate object be vnknowne to vs ? Againe : what certainty haue we of the tru *Diſtance* it ſelf? Doth not the moone riſing over a houſe ſeeme to touch it? When a thing is within 20. yeards, or a mile of vs, we diſcerne the different diſtances; but can we perceiue the different diſtances of ſeveral parts in the ſurface of the moone, or ſun? Or of thoſe of Other *Planets*, & the fixt ſtars. How can the *Diſtance* competent ſecure our eyes, from miſtakes, when diſtance it ſelfe is ſo obſcure, & vncertaine ? When you haue anſwered all theſe queſtions, I ſhall require you to anſwer two more.

The 1. what vnqueſtionable certainty you haue of all thoſe Anſwers? Jf you haue none, then theſe conditions cannot ſecure vs

from all possibility of errour in crediting our *Senses.*

The 2. whither the certainty of these conditions being exactly observed, be equal to that we haue, that what God says is tru? If the certainty of the truth of God's words be greater then that of those conditions, than we must conclude, that *To appeale to Senses, in opposition to God's expresse words*, is *rash*, *dangerous*, *& obnoxious to Errour.*

SECTION XIII.

Reasons for the credit of senses.

1. *We may rely on our senses.*
2. *Courts of Iustice as free from errour amongst Catholicks, as others.*
3. *Depositions of senses subordinate to those of God.*
4. *Our Doctrine doth not ground scepticisme.*
5. *Scriptures, & Church not prejudiced by Transubstantiation.*
6. *Conclusion.*

1. D. M. p. 17. *What can be more knowne, than* Bread *&* wine? *If than we may be mistaken in these, what vse, what certainly of* Senses *in any thing else? And if there be not certainty of* Senses, *why doth God command the* Israelits *to remember what they had* Seene, *&* Heard, *& teach it their Children?*

Rev. I do not see that *Faith* is lesse taught, or lesse strongly beleived, where *Transubstantiation* is taught, then where tis rejected. Or that seasons would be changed, the Earth lesse fruitfull, or men lesse wise, or lesse knowne to Relations, or Freinds, should God worke some other Changes vnobservable to *Senses*, & reveale it to vs. We credit our *Senses*, as much as you, where God doth not reveale the contrary: what more can be due to any Created faculty? Can

Can we not prefer God's veracity before our *Senses*, but we must absolutely & vniversally reject these even where they conforme with Faith? All discourse relyes on that principle: *Eadem vni tertio sunt idem inter se*, which is hardly reconcilable with the mystery of the *Trinity*. Yet we do not suspect a fallacy in all other discourse, because we make no exception, but where God excepts, & he excepts only in that one mystery. So we excepting against *senses* only in this particular, where God excepts, leaues them at full liberty, & in full credit in all things else.

D. M. p. 18. All matters of controversy both Civil, & Criminal *Were by God's appointment to be decided by the Testimony of two, or three* Witnesses. *Now how can any man beare witnesse, if he be vncertain of what he* Heares, *or* sees? *How is the Iudg certain he doth not condemne an innocent man?*

Revisor. I suspect it not very prudent, to reproach Catholick courts of judicature with condemning Innocent men, & beleiving vncertain depositions of witnesses, at this time of the day. Those who deny *Transubstantiation* can take in judgment a dog for a wolf, An innocent man for a Traitour, & *Peter* for *Iudas*, as well as their neyghbours. Your Aversion to this insensible change hath left Protestants as obnoxious to errour, as other folkes: witnesse the *Tall slender flaxen hayred D. Iohn*, the *Iesuits* house in *Paris* next dore to the *Louure*: men seene in several places the same time, one sworne to be *Blundel*, another to be *Hesketh*, to whome they had no neerer relation, then *Iaphet*, as for as we can discover: & for this I appeale to the *Heralds*. And our last fiue ye ares transactions afford twenty other odde example, which I wish were buryed in oblivion, & recorded no where, but in God's booke of mercy, amongst the sins forgiuen.

3. D. M. p. 18. 20. *If there be no certainty of* Sense, *why did* Christ *vpbraide Chorasin &* Bethsaide *for not beleving after having so many Miracles? Why doth S.* Iohn *to proue the word was made* Flesh, *tell vs*, he saw, heard, & handled it? *Why did the Angel to proue* The Resur-

Resurrection, *bid* Mary Magdalen come, & see the place, where the Lord lay? *As inferring, if he could not be seene, he was not there. A shrewd inference against* Transubstantiation. *Why did* Christ *bid* Thomas *thrust his hand into his side? Why did* Christ *ascend into Heaven, in the sight of his Disciples? Why did* Luke *say, he writ what he had from eye witnesses? Why did S.* Peter *say he was an eye witnesse of what he writ? Why was the ghospel written, or preacht, if we are not sure of what we* See, *or* Heare? *Why were tru* Miracles *anciently done, or false ones lately pretended to? Why doth the* Church *proue her owne* Being *by* Notes, *which if* Senses *be fallible can ground no certainty.*

Rev. Your *Whys* at this rate may reach from *Genesis*, to the *Apocalypse*, & hooke in, to boote, all *Ecclesiastical Hystory*, & hold vs a long lent's Reading: which would haue contributed something more to confound an Ignorant Reader, & tire out one, who would answer you. Yet you will misse even of that aime, for one answer will satisfy all; all your questions being grounded on one false supposition. To cleere this I will vse one example.

We are by Divine, & Humane laws bound to obey the King, & his Officers, according to their several degrees, & the Authority communicated to them. Yet with this difference: that our obedience to the King is absolute, & without reserue, in temporal things: that to his Officers is conditional, only as long as they continu obedient to the King. But if these command vs to take vp armes against the King, & do what he forbids, we cease to be obliged to obey them, & are obliged not to obey them. If you say: as subjects we are bound to obey them, who haue Commissions from the King: I grant it, as long, as they continu in their duty; but no further. now multiply *Queres* vpon this subject till *Doomes day*, whither at their command, we are bound to take Armes, to come to a *Rendez vous*, to stand sentinel, shut the gates of a towne, open them, seize a man, dismisse him, advance, present, giue fire, retreate, &c? To these questions one answer is sufficient. Whilst they command nothing contrary to the Kings will, & service, they are to be ob-

be obeyd: when we are certain they designe a Rebellion, & rayse men onely to destroy the King, & build for themselues on his ruins, we are not bound to obey them; but rather bound not to obey them.

J answer in alike manner to all your *Whys*. Our *Vnderstanding* receiues some knowledge from God, by (either immediate, or mediate) Revelation: & some by our *Senses*. It is a general duty to admit whatever truly comes from God. We may admit, what comes from senses, provided it be not contrary to what God averres: but if they depose any thing contrary to what God reveales, either in his written, or vnwritten word, we must renounce them, & stick to the revealed Truth. So if they tell me a thing is *Chalke*, & God tells me it is *Cheese*, they must pardon me, if I rather beleiue God, & beleiue it to be *Cheese*.

Thus althô (contrary to four *Senses*, but not to *Hearing*) I beleiue *Transubstantiation* because God reveales it, I may beleiue that I see a *Ship*, & go into it to crosse the seas: that I see *Bread*, & eate it, when I am hungry: that J see *Wine*, & drink it when J am thirsty: that I see a freind, & rejoice in his company: that I see a good action, & commend it. That I see a crime committed, & procure it be redrest by publicke Iustice: that I reade a Hystory or heare a story, & beleiue it: In fine giue as full credit to the verdict of *Senses*, as any *Protestant*, excepting onely that point, which God tells me senses are deceived in.

This well considered, I see no reason for those dismal apprehensions from our beleife of *Transubstantiation* as if by it Laws were made vselesse, the sword of justice broken, humane society dissolved, all Doctrine Divine, & Humane made voyde, & of no vse, & both *Church* & *state* brought to confusion, & destruction. Rivers may run vnder a bridge, & winds blow from the same points of the compasse, *Senses* left to their functions, & we to their direction in all other things, though *Transubstantiation* be beleived.

D. M, p. 21. *To deny the evidence, & certainty of* Sense, *is in effect to deny all Possibility of* Learning, *or of* Teaching, *or of* Know-

ing

ing, *or of* Beleiving *any thing what soever*, & *brings a necessity of being a perfect* Sceptick, *not only in other* Arts, *&* Sciences; *but in divinity it selfe also.*

Revisor. To secure you against this Phantôme, I appeal to common experience to shew, where *Scepticks* in matters of Religion a bound most, in the *Catholick*, or in the *Protestant Communion*: & let that decide, whither Doctrine, yours, or ours, opens a wider dore to *Scepticisme.* What Doctrine Divine, & Humane haue your Brethren Reformers spared? What authority so venerable, as they haue not vndermined? What law of God so necessary, as they haue not rendred ineffectual, by teaching all the commandments are impossible? What rite so sacred, as they haue not derided? What Article of Faith fundamental, as they haue not questioned, & rejected? And when by your insolent combating *Revealed Truths*, you haue weakned the *Church*, shaked to pieces *Faith*, & rooted vp what had been planted by *Christ*, watred by the *Apostles*, & growne vp in following ages, & by this brought into the world, & countenanced *Libertinisme*, *Atheisme*, & *Scepticisme*, you Charge them on vs: just as the late long *Parliament* charged the civil wars, & that *Iliad* of miserys, caused by themselues, on King *Charles* 1. Keepe to your selues those deformed brats, they are yours: & the essential Principles of your first Reformers are evident Premisses to these vnavoidable conclusions. Your *Luther*, your *Calvin*, your *Zuinglius*, your *Ivel* eate the sowre grapes, which set all your teeth on edge: They layd the egges, out of which these cockatrices are hatcht. And while you retaine your owne Principles, you must expect the same odious encrease of mischeif.

5. E. M. p. 21. *If there be no certainty of* Senses, *how know they, that it is the* Body *&* Bloud *of* Christ? *By immediate* Inspiration; *or by* Seing *the* Scripture, *or* Hearing *the* Church? *They pretend to no immediate* Inspiration. Seing *the* Scriptures, & hearing *the* Church *cannot be relyed on, because there is no certainty of* Senses.

Revisor. The first part, I admit, that we do not rely on any immediate

mediate *Revelation*, or jnſpiration. The reſt, that we cannot rely on what we *See* in *Scripture*, and *Heare* from the *Church*, you know is contrary to our ſentiments, & abſolutely falſe. *Hæc ſi imprudens facis, nihil cæcius: ſi prudens, nihil ſceleratius.* S. Auſtin l. cont. Adam. c. 15. *If you reproach vs that Paradox*, not knowing we abhorre it, *What is more blind than you? If you know we renounce it, yet charge it on vs, what more wicked than you?*

6. D. M. p. 21. 22. *Their Interpretation of this place of* Scripture *muſt needs fruſtrate, & make voyde the vſe & end of all* Scripture, *& of the* Church *it ſelf alſo: & conſequently it is not a tru one.*

Rev. Here is a lame jllation, out of two falſe Premiſſes as J haue shewed. And J appeale to any man, who hath but common ſenſe, to decide whither make voyde the *Scripture*, we, who ſubſcribe to it, or you, who contradict it? *Scripture* ſays: *That is Chriſt's Body.* Catholicks ſay: *That is Chriſt's Body. Non-Catholicks* ſay: *That is not Chriſt's Body.* Credit your eyes, for whome you pleade, & ſee whither part *Fruſtrates* the end of *Scripture*, we ſubſcribe to *Scripture*, we defend it: if we are deceived, God hath deceived vs. But he cannot deceiue vs: ſo we are ſure, we are not deceived. As for you, you contradict the ſcripture, your *Senſes* delude you, you fyght againſt the ſcripture, or if for it, it is only as your *Tru proteſtants* fought for the King.

D. M. p. 22. *If there be no* Tranſubſtantiation, *the* Papiſts *are as groſſe* Jdolaters *as the* Heathens *ſays Coſterus* a Ieſuit.

Reviſor. If the Heavens fall, we may catch larkes, And if an Aſſe flyes, he will moue ſwiftly. But what do theſe conditional Propoſitions ſignify, while the conditions ramble in the imaginary ſpaces of impoſſible *Beings*, & are only the objects of fancifull heads? You will go hungry to bed, if for your ſupper you rely on thoſe Larkes: & you will as ſoon performe your journy riding on a ſnayle, as if you expect the winged Aſſe. And *Papiſts* neede not feare *Hell*, or *Purgatory*, if they haue no other ſin to Anſwer for, than beleiving *Chriſt's* Body to be, where he ſays it is: and *Adoring* him there,

ſolely becauſe they firmely beleiue that he is there: having his owne expreſſe words for their warrant.

Concluſion of this Book. An appeale from the ſole competent judge, which knoweth, & can determine, to one in competent, who nether knoweth the thing in queſtion, nor can decide it, is an evident ſigne of a deſperate Cauſe. You appeale from the ſole competent judge, *God* & *his Church*, to one incompetent, the *Senſes*, which nether know the thing in queſtion, the meaning of the words of *Chriſt*, nor can pronounce ſentence in it. Therefore your Cauſe is deſperate.

Otherwiſe thus: A ſentence of an incompetent judge is inſignificant. The *Senſations* are a ſentence of incompetent judges: therefore they are inſignificant.

THE THIRD BOOK.

A REVISION

OF THE VINDICATION OF THE ARGVMENT FROM SENSE.

THE PREFACE.

I Do not profeſſe my ſelfe a common champion, for all Catholicks, that either Attacke *Proteſtants*, or are Attackt by them. Had God called me to that taske, he would haue endowed me with a greater ſtrength of mind, & Body, a larger extent of knowledge, & more leaſure from other employments, then I haue. Wherefore I confine my ſelfe to a much narrower ſphere, more proportioned to my abilityes, viz,

viz, to that *Faith, which was once delivered to the Saints* Iude verse 3. for which seing all are obliged *Earnestly to contend*, I see my self vnder that general obligation. As also to the defence of our Holy mother the Church, by whome we receiue this *Faith*, without whose assistance *Faith* it self, that precious gif of our bountifull lord, would fayle. As for the sentiments of other private persons, the being of the Church, the jnnocency of our Doctrine, & the purity of our Faith, not depending on them, I think it no necessary duty to make good all they say, further than that cannot be destroyed without weakning Faith. And in alike manner I do not expect, nor desire, any should concerne themselues for what I say, but only on like occasions, that it be such, as Faith would receiue some dammage, were it confuted. If any one, out of an opinion, that J go astray, or am in an errour in what J write in defense of the *Church*, will take the paines to shew it me, with Charity, & meekenesse, J shall thank him for his labour, & either acknowledge my personal errour, if it be such, or giue a reason why I do not.

Hence I was for some time doubtfull, whither I should review this *Vindication*, no body being concerned in it, besides the nameless Authour of an obsure Pamphlet, whose merits are as obscure as his person nameless; especially some of his opinions being far different, from what the *Church*, her self, as well as divines hold; if his meaning be sincerely represented by my freind D. M. & ryghtly vnderstood by me. And I think the *Argument from sense* low enough; whither this *Anonimus* stand, or fall: althô M. Doctor page 4. is pleased to say, that if this Pamphlet falls, his *Argument remaines not only vnanswered; but vnanswerable*: as if that anonimus were our *Hector*, & our *Troy* were to be defended by his hand, or by none at all. Yet I am of opinion, that my Reader will find something in my Review of the Argument, to which what is here sayd, will not giue full satisfaction, probably it will scarce be brought within canon shot of it. So my Review of this Treatise is a worke of supererogation, which J vndertake meerely because there is occasion

casion giuen to handle some few material points, which further confirme what I haue sayd, if well vnderstood.

SECTION XIV.

1. *Division of Miracles.*
2. *Some insensible, out of scripture.*
3. *Arguments from Ætymology of words, or names, frivolous.*

1. WHo that man was, whome p. 1. you call *Namelesse* is not material: but why you should stile his Pamphlet *Worthlesse*, I know not. I haue never seene it, to my knowledge, yet what you cite out of him (bating some phrases, which to your polite eares sound harsh, as some of mine will) It speakes it not much inferiour to some others. Then you giue vs a view of as much of the whole treatise as relates to your *Argument*: which I will omit here, being content with once viewing them, as they occurre afterwards.

The first thing setled by this *Anonimus* is that some *Miracles* are *Sensible*, *others insensible*. Or, as he says, some are *Motiues to Faith*, others *Objects of Faith*: which is very neere the same, as to our present purpose: This distinction disgruntles you, who cannot suffer that any *Miracles* should be sayd to be *Insensible*. But I will proue there are such,

Because 1. *Christ* was borne *Clauso Virginis Deipara vtero*: without any prejudice to the virginal integrity of his Blessed mother. This was a *Miracle*, as is evident: yet it was not *Sensible*. Therefore some Miracles are not *Sensible*.

2. His coming out of the sepulcher shut vp, with a greate stone, & sealed

& ſealed, was it not *Miraculous?* Can two bodyes naturally be penetrated? Could his ſacred body paſſe through that ſtone, without penetration of two ſolid bodyes [ſuch were that of *Chriſt*, & that ſtone] miraculous? And if you ſay *Chriſts* body paſt from the place in the ſepulcher to that without the ſtone, without paſſing the middle ſpace *Ab extremo ad extremum, ſine medio*, that skip will be *Miraculous*, & *inſenſible* too. ſo it will confirme what I ſay. You cannot ſay the ſtone was removed, for him to paſſe: for it is evident, that *Angel coming from Heaven roaled away the ſtone, who was found ſitting vpon it.* Mat. 28. 2.

3. Alike *Miracle* hapned, when he entred into the chamber, where his Diſciples were aſſembled. Here was again a penetration of two bodyes: & by what *Senſes*, or *Senſe* was it perceived? They ſaw, they heard, they toucht him, when he was entred, & ſtood in the midſt of them: but his very entrance, [which was *Miraculous*] was vnknowne to all, & not perceived by any till it was paſt, ſo the Miracle it ſelfe was *Inſenſible*. Theſe three *Miracles* being ſo evident in ſcripture, could not es cape the piercing eyes of the Fathers, let vs heare their opinion of them.

S. Ambroſe l. 10. com. in Lucæ c. 24. *Mirum quomodo ſe natura corporea per impenetrabile Corpus infuderit, inviſibili aditu, viſibili conſpectu. It is wonderfull*, [or Miraculous] *how a corporal ſubſtance could inſinuate it ſelf through a firme impenetrable body, it being inviſible at his entrance*, Which was miraculous, *viſible after it.* Note that *inviſibili aditu: his entrance inviſible*, or *inſenſible*. By theſe that glorious Doctor of the Church declares that all *Miracles* are not *Senſible*, which is a novelty to this old D. D.

S. *Auguſtin*, Epiſt. 3. ad Voluſianum: *Ipſa virtus per inviolatæ Matris Virginea viſcera membra infantis eduxit, quæ poſtea per clauſa oſtia membra juvenis introduxit. Hic ſi ratio quæritur, non erit mirabile; ſi exemplum poſcitur, non erit ſingulare. Demus Deum aliquid poſſe, quod nos fateamur inveſtigari non poſſe. In talibus rebus tota ratio facti eſt potentia facientis. That ſame Power brought to lyght the Infants body*

through

through the virginal Womb of his mother, which afterwards, when at mans estate brought that same body, through the shut dores into the Chamber. If you seeke a reason for this, It will not *be Wonderfull; if you require an example, it will not be singular. In such things the Power of the Workman is the sole & total reason of the Worke.*

Amongst S. Austin's works there is a 2. sermon vpon the saturday in Easter-weeke, who ever be the Authour of it. In it I find these words: *Quid mirum, si Dominus ad Discipulos glorificatum Corpus, claustris stupentibus intromisit, qui illæso Materni pudoris signaculo januam mundi huius intravit.* All confirm the same.

S. Gregory hom. 26. in Evang. *Quomodo post Resurrectionem Corpus Dominicum verum fuit quod clausis januis ad Discipulos ingredi potuit? Sed sciendum nobis est, quod divina operatio, si ratione comprehenditur, non est admirabilis: nec fides habet meritum, cui humana ratio præbet experimentum.* Thus the Apostle of our Nation. *How was Christ's body real after his Resurrection, which could enter to the Disciples, the dores being shut? But We are to take notice, that the divine Workes cease to be admirable, when Reason comprehends them: & Faith ceases to be meritorious, when it begins to rely on Human discourse.*

Out of these Authoritys, it is evident 1. that those three passages of Christ's body out of his B. mother wombe, out of the sepulcher, & into the Chamber, were by the Fathers esteemed *Miraculous*, & indeed no man in his wits will deny it. And 2. that these passages were not perceptible by any sense; but were truly *Insensible*: *Quod erat probandum.*

My 4. Proofe is the Miracle of stopping the fountain of Bloud of the woman, mar. 5. no body perceived this, besides God, & the woman her self. Et had not he by enquiry forced her to owne it publickly before all the throng, nether we now, nor those then present had knowne any thing of it.

5. When our lord walked on the sea, Iohn 6. 19. for about thirty furlongs, or neere four miles. That walking on the waters was *Miraculous* from the beginning, for to each part of that fluid & yeilding

ding Body, which his ſacred feete toucht, he gaue the conſiſtency of a firme floore. Yet who ſaw, who heard, who felt, or perceived this *In the dark*, till towards the end of his walke, when drawing neere the ship, he was deſcryed by his Diſciples?

6. The caſting out of devils was not ſenſible: for nether the local motion of ſpirits, nor ſpirits themſelues are objects of *Senſe*, yet how frequent are theſe in ſcripture?

Laſtly Iohn 21. 25. An vnconceivable number of miracles were ſayd to done by *Ieſus*, which are no where written, for the bookes would fill the world. It is rash to ſay, all theſe were done in the ſyght of many, there being no proofe for it in ſcripture, or Fathers. I know, that Iohn 20. 30. *Many other ſignes*, not recorded in ſcripture, are ſayd *To haue beene done in ths syght of the diſciples.* But it will be no eaſy taske to proue, that none but ſuch hinted at here, are meant in that other place. So it is very probable that of thoſe many Miracles ſome were done in private, none, or very few, knowing of, feelling, ſeing, or by any ſenſe perceiving them. Let vs now harken to our freind.

D. M. p. 4. *No ſuch diſtinction of Miracles is found in the Ghoſpel:* thoſe of *Chriſt* & his Diſciples were evident to *Senſes.*

Rev. Anſwer 1. this is not tru, I haue giuen you many inſtances of *Miracles* not evident to *Senſes*, recorded in ſcripture.

Anſwer 2. The deſigne of the *Evangeliſts* in recording the *Miracles* of *Chriſt*, was that men *Should beleiue* that *Ieſus is the Chriſt.* Iohn 20. 31. & ſeing they could not record all his Miracles, they choſe out cheifely ſuch as were publick, & moſt convincing the veracity of the *Tru Catholick evidence*, *Ieſus Chriſt.* So *Catholicks*, to proue the *Falshood*, of the *Tru Proteſtant evidence*, *Oates*, make vſe of ſuch vntruths, as are publicke, & confirmed by Oath, leaving out very many vntruths, vented by him in private.

D. M. p. 4. *The onely end of all Miracles is to make men beleiue ſome Truths.* This end failes in ſuch as are not *Senſible.* Therefore there are none ſuch.

Rev.

Rev. Your first proposition is absolutely false. I haue often acquainted you with several other *Ends*, for which God may do, & hath done *Miracles.*

3. D. M. p. 5. *Aquinas contradicts himself, when he says some Miracles are invisible. For he says else where, that name comes from admiration now how can a thing imperceptible to Senses be the cause of Admiration?*

Rev. Answer 1. words in definitions signify not the actual Being; but the aptnesse to be. *Non significant Actum; sed aptitudinem*, say *Sophists*: soe if the worke be such, as when knowne it would cause Admiration, that is enough to conclude that it is admirable.

Ans. 2. Arguments drawne from the Etimology of words, are frivolous, & insignificant. *Pontifex* was named from making, or mending a Bridge. *Præsul* from leading a sacred dance of the salij, Preists of *Mars*, *Senatus* as an Assembly of old men. Will you thence conclude, that no man ought to be called *Pontifex*, or *Præsul*, or *Senator*, but who hath made or mended a Bridge, lead a dance, or is an old man? In Englisk Alderman comes from Age: yet who regards old Age in the Creation of that Magistrate? A *Bishop* hath his name from *Vigilancy*: & a *Deacon* from serving: yet the first is giuen to some who are drowzy enough; the second to such, as never served. Some men haue transmitted to their successours in Bloud names taken from offices, which no way belong to them, such are *Smith*, *Tayler*, *Butler*, *Warner*, *Fryer*, *Preist*, *Monk*, *Deane*, *Bishop*, Cooke, &c. Why may not some others do the like to their successours in Dignity?

Ans. 3 cannot we admire things imperceptible to *Senses?* Is not the *Vnion hypostatical* an object of Admiration to all *Christians?* Is not God's birth of a Virgin, admirable? Can we sufficiently admire the loue of Gnd towards man, declared by the Passion of his only son? And is not the Divine Essence, & Trinity of persons in one nature, admirable both to men, & Angels? And are these, or any one of them, perceptible to *Sense?* But enough of this childish Argument.

SECTION

SECTION XV.

1. *Accidents without a subject.*

2. *Extention of quantity in a place.*

3. *A Body in two places.*

1. D. M. p. 9. *Thomas* contradicts himself in other places. For 1. p. q. 90. ar. 2. C. he sayth: *An accident hath no being, but as something is denominated by it.* That *it rather belongs to, than is an entity*, That its *whole being is to be in something.* Yet he teaches that in the Sacrament Accidents are without a subject.

Revisor. What difficulty is there, that God should do, what nature cannot? And how greate soever is the dependance of *Accidents* on *Substance* why can not God separate them, & supply by his omnipotency, the want of a subject, as the *Protestants* owne he can preserue *Substance* without *Accidents*, althô it needes them very much? The being of an *Accident* is to *Informe*, *inesse*: & that of a *Substance*, is to receiue information, *Subesse*. Now if God can preserue a *Substance*, without receiving *Accidents*, why not *Accidents*, without being received? These two are correlatiues, tis tru: but Relatiues may haue a being without their terme You will say, they cease to be relatiues, when the terme is gon, retaining only an aptnesse to a new relation, when it hath a new terme: & I reply this is just what passes in our case. For the *Accidents* after *Transubstantiation* haue no actual Relation to *Substance*, but an aptnesse to one, when occasion is presented. And for this reason *Accidents* in the Sacrament, are sayd to haue an existence like in some sort, to substance: *Habent modum existendi substantiæ* Yet it is distinguisht from all *Substance*, by that expresse, & natural propension it hath to denominat substance, & it suffers violence till it be restored to its innate manner of being in a substance, as a stone doth, when it is suspended in the Ayre.

D. p. q. *Aquinas teachs that quantity hath extension of parts, in respect of place; yet in the sacrament he sayth it hath none. In which he contradicts himself.*

Revisor. *Quantity* hath two effects; one in the *Substance*, which it informes: the other in the place, which it fills. The first is *In genere causæ formalis*, as a forme: & this effect of quantity is in *Christ's* Body in the sacrament very perfectly, for his sacred Body being aliue, or animated with his rational soul, it must be *Corpus organicum* which imports a distinction of parts from one another.

The other effect, as to the place it fills, is *In genere causæ efficientis*, as an efficient, & actiue cause, by a certain elasticity, & springinesse of the parts of a body, which thrust backe such bodyes, as on all sides presse vpon it. which by moderne experiences is evident in the Ayre, & in alike manner may be proved of other things. Hence the same *Quantity* hath sometimes a greater, sometimes a lesser extension in order to place, according as the ambient bodyes do more, or lesse, presse vpon it, & its elasticity is more, or lesse actiue. Thus in the top of a very hygh hill in *Auvergne*, askin well stopt seemed full of Ayre; & at the bottome of it, where the Athmosphere prest much, it wanted much of seeming full. Also a ball of Brasse, with a little pin hole, being halfe fild with water, containes it all very well: till by being to a certain degree heated in afire, its elasticity is encreased, for then the water & Ayre mingled will breake throngh that narrows passage, & fill the chamber with a kind of mist. Now if a *Quantity* of fiue foote, for example, by diminishing its *Elasticity*, or encreasing the pressures of ambient Bodys, be brought to four, or three feete, why may it not be reduced to two, or one? Or by Divine Power quite suspending its *Elasticity*, be brought to an vnconceivable littlenesse of place, which would scarce deserue that name. If fire, the most actiue cause knowne, had no effect on the three children in the *Babilonian furnace*, God suspending its vertu, why cannot God suspend the actiue vertu of a little *Quantity*?

which

Which I do not say, to demonstrate fully the whole mysterious manner of the existence of the Body of Christ, in this Divine Sacrament (that being a thing to be beleived by faith; not to be proved, or even comprehended, & perfectly vnderstood by naturall reason) but only to diminish the difficulty of the beleife of it, by explicating in some probable manner a part of the mystery.

You see, sir, how easy it is to excuse S. *Thomas* from the contradiction, you charge him with: for it is no contradiction to say: *A fire well kindled burnes matter combustible duly applyed*: & *in the furnace fire did not burne those three young men.* Both which we know to be tru, one by experience, the other by Revelation, why may not such an obvious explication excuse this greate Doctor, from so shamefull a fault as contradicting himself is? That all quantity fills some space is a general rule: that in the Sacrament it doth not, is an exception from this rule. Can you not vnderstand how a man without contradicting himself admits an exception from his Rule?

3. D M. p. 10. *Lastly Thomas, & all the rest teach, that no other body can be in more places, than one at one time: yet they say Christs body in the Sacrament, is in many places at the same time. Thus they mantain what their church hath defined, though it be with doing violence to all the principles not of* Divinity *only; but of* Nature, sense, & Reason: *& not without manifest, & manifold contradictions not of one another onely; but even of themselues also.*

Revisor. The contradiction you charge on S. *Thomas*, & *all Catholicks*, *is* that we teach that *Christ's body is in two places, at once*: & that we deny, that *Any other body can be in two places at once.* Where your first fault, is against *Logick*: for you beleiue these two propositions to be contradictions, & they are not so. For a contradiction is *Affirmatio, & negatio eiusdem de eodem*, the same thing must be sayd, & denyed of the same subject: now here is not the same subject: for Christs body, & other bodys are not the same. Hence it is no contradiction to say: *Christs body is personally vnited to the word*: and, *no other body is personally vnited to the word.*

Your second fault is more reproachfull, a lack of sincerity in relating our sentiments. You say, we teach that *No other body*, (but that of *Christ*.) *can be in more places than one, at the same time.* Which is so far from being tru, that I will challenge you, or any other in the world, to produce any one, either Divine, or Philosopher, of the Catholick communion who denyes to *Any body a passiue capacity of being in two places, when God shall determine, in that same manner, that he beleiues Christ's body is in two places.* And if I am disproved in this, I am content to be thought the Impostor. Had you consulted either our Phylosophers, or Divines, or even any of our yearly conclusions, you would haue found instances enough to correct your mistake, if it were not affected: which I will not determine. I say *In that same manner, that he beleiues Christ's body is in two places*: because I know the *Thomists* hold a body cannot be *Extensivè*, *Localitèr*, or *Definitivè* in two places, [& the *Scotists* hold the contrary] but those same learned men say the same of the Body of *Christ*. So your mistake is vnexcusable.

Your third fault, is, that *Our Doctrine is contrary to all principles of Divinity.* I know no other, at least no better, *Principles of tru Divinity*, than *Scripture*, *Tradition*, *Definitions* of the *Church*, & *Fathers*. If you know any better, make vs happy by communicating them. Now I am sure our Doctrine is not contrary to these; nay it is grounded on them all: & this you knew so well, that you haue carefully avoyded all mention of them, as conscious of your contradicting them all, & foreseing that they are rockes, on which this *Sensual Heresy* would split it self. Scripture says, *It is Christs body*: Tradition says the same, so do Fathers, so doth the Church: so do we. Not one Egge more like another, than our Doctrine, is to theirs. *What violence then do we do, to all the principles of Divinity?* But it is not vnusual, that men, who rob, cry *Theiues*. You know you cannot proue that we oppose any one principle of Divinity: so you never attempt it. Yet you would haue it beleived, & *Therefore you beg it.*

Your

Your fourth fault is, that you blame vs, as faulty, for going in matters of *Faith*, against *Nature*, *Sense*, & *Reason*. Sir we are Disciples of S. *Paul*, of him we haue learnt, *To cast downe imaginations, & every hygh thing, that exalts it self against the knowledge of God, & bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ.* 2. cor. 10. 6. This we practice in this, & other matters. If in this we are blameworthy, condemne him, who directs vs to do so: if you dare not condemne him, you must absolue vs.

Call to mind S. Austins words, mentioned aboue, in Epist. ad Volusianum: *Si ratio quæritur, non erit mirabile: si exemplum poscitur, non erit singulare. If a reason be found out, it will cease to be admirable: if an example be produced, it will not be singular.* We owne it is *Admirable*, we professe it is *Singular*. So we expect nether Reason, nor example to confirme vs in the beleife of it. That is, we are nether *Socinians*, nor *Morleyans*. Iust so we beleiue the same *Christ* to be borne of a virgin, thô nether Reason, nor experience confirme it.

Yet out of some other places of scripture joyned together, it appeares, that Christ's body hath been in two places, at the same time. For we learne out of Ephes. 4. 10. that *He ascended vp far aboue all Heavens:* whence Heb. 7. 26 he is sayd *To be Hygher then the Heavens.* And Act. 13. 21. we reade: *Whome the Heavens must receiue, till the time of restitution of all things*: that is till the vniversal Resurrection, he must remaine aboue the Heavens. Yet he was seene by S. *Paul*, 1. Cor. 15. 8. & Act. 9. Therefore he was in two places at the same time: In Heaven, & aboue the Heavens, as the scripture says: & neere the Earth, otherwise the Apostle could nether haue seene his Body, nor heard his voice.

You begin pag. 11. a long discourse about *Mysteryes*. Which being nothing to the purpose, I leaue it, as I find it: & passe to the your 19. page, where I find something in which I am concerned.

SECTION

SECTION XVI.

Transubstantiation is a Miracle.

MY reason is, because it is a worke not only *Besides*, or *Above*; but *Contrary* to second causes. Therefore it is a Miracle. The illation is evident, as being from the definition, to the thing defined. The antecedent is cleere, first from the littlenesse of the space or rather the no space, to which *Christs* Body is reduced. Secondly from its being in many places at once. Answer this Reason, *& eris mihi magnus Apollo.* What haue you against this?

D. M. p. 19. *Scripture makes no mention of any* Miracle *in this* Sacrament, *as no doubt it would haue done, if there had beene any, seing no man can perceiue it.*

Rev. Must nothing be counted a *Miracle*, but what scripture calls such? Then we must blot out of our Catalogue of *Miracles*, a greate part of those recorded in *Scripture* it self. But you say, *No doubt it would haue called it so*: & I say I doubt of it, & my doubt is confirmed by many instances, of *Miracles* recorded in scripture, without being called so. That of rayes, for example, on *Moses* Face. But you say, this was *Sensible*, which the other is not. And I say that is nothing to the purpose, as I haue often shewed. However it is evident enough: for it appeares by the words of *Christ*, that he is there: & our *Senses* tell vs that he is not visible there.

D. M. p. 19. *It is no* Miracle, *because it is not onely not evident to* Sense; *but moreover it is contrary to* Sense.

Rev. Here you serue vp againe your cold cabbadge: which how insipid they were at first, we haue *Seene*, now we nauseate them. Yet for four pages you afford vs no other foode.

D. M. p. 23. *God never workes a* Miracle, *but for some greate, & good* End, *which cannot be obtained without it, for God doth nothing in vaine. Now such a Miracle would be to no purpose, for* Christ *sayd the flesh profiteth nothing.*

Rev

Reviſor. The Apoſtles, the Fathers, the Church, the Faith full all over the world had & haue a far different opinion of the ſacramental Communion of the Body & Bloud of *Chriſt*, than you haue. S. Paul makes vſe of that conſideration to moue men to try themſelues before they approach the Divine Table: leaſt by receiving it vnworthily, they become guilty of the *Body* & *Bloud* of *Chriſt*. S. *Cyril* of *Hieruſalem*, ſays that by it we are *Chriſtophori*, *Bearers of Chriſt*, jtem *Conſanguinei* his kinſmen. S. *Chriſoſtome*: you deſire „ to ſee *Chriſt*, to heare his voice, to touch the hemme of his „ garment: more is granted to you; that you eate him, &c. Againe „ when deſcribes a Preiſt at the Altar, with quires of Angels round „ about him the Heavens open over his head, God the holy ghoſt „ cooperating with him, God the ſon in his hands to be offred to „ the Eternal Father, who is aboue expecting to receiue that moſt „ gratefull offering, doth all this avayle nothing? Was the centurion „ moved with the conſideration of his owne vnworthineſſe, being „ to receiue *Chriſt* vnder his roofe; & is our Faith ſo dead, as to „ be inſenſible when he vouchſafes to come into our boſomes? „ What can, if this doth not, ſtir vp in vs ſorrow for having of- „ fended Almyghty God: *Faith* in him, whome we beleiue preſent: „ *Hope*, that he, who hath giuen himſelf vnto vs, will not, can „ not refuſe vs any thing. And an intire & ſincere Loue of him, „ who hath loved vs, & doth loue vs ſo much, as to giue himſelf „ for all in general, & to each one in particular? Beſides acts of „ Devotion, of Adoration, of Humility, of Zeale, &c.

„ All which if you eſteeme inconſiderable, & to *Profit nothing*, „ I deſire you to tell me, what doth profit in the way of vertu? You will ſay *Faith*. And J will anſwer we haue that as well, as you, & that quickned, & ſtrengthned by the conſideration of him really preſent, who is both Authour, & Object, or laſt end, the A. & Ω. of our Faith.

Jn fine S. *Eucherius* ſayd: *Tria ſibi Deus ſtruxit tabernacula*, &c. God hath ſet vp for himſelf three tents, the Synagogue, the Chriſtian Church

Church, & Heaven. In the firſt, there is nothing but *Types* of things hoped for: in the laſt, *Subſtance* without any *Types*: in the *Chriſtian Church Subſtance* vnder *Types*: That ſame *Chriſt*, who was figured to the Iews, & is cleerely ſeene, & enjoyed by the Bleſſed in Heaven, being really preſent vnder *Types* on our Altars. And you Proteſtants by denying this preſence of *Chriſt*, in this Divine Sacrament, what do you, but degrade your Communion from the dignity of a Sacrament of the new law, & bring it to the condition of a jewiſh rite, of a baſe *Beggarly element*.

But *The flesh profiteth nothing*, ſay you. I grant it, if it be taken carnally, & without ſpirit, or Faith, without diſcerning betwixt that, & other Bodily food; not otherwiſe. For can you, or will you ſay, that *That* flesh avayles nothing, by which we were redeemed? Will you ſay with your late tru *Proteſtant Oracle*, that we were never the better, for *Christs being crucifyed for vs?*

D. M. p. 24. 25. *Laſtly there can be no ſuch* Miracle, *as* Tranſubſtantiation, *becauſe all* Miracles *are poſſible*; Tranſubſtantiation *is impoſſible*. And you ſend vs to ſee this proved in D. *Whitaker Bishop* Morton *& Mr.* Chillingworth, *who shew* ſay you *that this implyes contradiction, & ſuch things cannot be done: nay it would argue rather an impotency, than omnipotency in God to doe ſuch things.*

Reviſor. You had done vs appleaſure, & Proteſtants would haue thought your time well ſpent, in producing Reaſons to proue this implicancy; & not to ſend vs, & them on this wild gooſe chace, to find what thoſe learned men ſay in this point. The meane while, what you haue ſayd, proues nothing: & the beleiſe of *Tranſubſtantiation* remaines firme: & *God*, and his Church *Tru.*

D. M. p. 27. *There is therefore no ſuch* Miracle *as* Tranſubſtantiation; *it being not onely an vſeleſſe thing, if it were ſo; but an impoſſible thing, that it should be lo.*

Reviſor: That *Tranſubſtantiation* is a *Miracle*, is a thing ſo evident to Reaſon, that I never feare to ſee the Reaſons for it anſwered. That it is *Vſeleſſe*, & impoſſible, you ſay, but you will never be able to perſuade the firſt, to any pious man, nor the ſecond, to any learned man.

THE FOVRTH BOOK.

A REVISION

OF D. M.'s ANSWER TO Mr CRESSEY'S LETTER.

HIS SERMON BEFORE THE KING.

HIS LETTER TO HER ROYAL HYGHNESSE.

ET HIS LETTER TO A PREIST.

THE PREFACE.

THese three pieces, containing not many doctrinal Points controverted betwixt the two *Churchs* of *Rome*, & *England*, will not detaine me long, in reviewing your judgment declared in them, especially considering that a greate part is personal, of Mr. *Cressey*, the *Gun powder Plotters*, & her R. H. which kind of things, whither tru, or false, may be let pa se without any prejudice to the *Catholick Cause*. For Personal sanctity of all Catholicks spread all over the world, is a thing to be wisht; not hoped for. And althô some faults, even of the first magnitude could be proved vpon some of them, yet that ought no more to moue any man to abandon the Communion of the *Church* now, than it did to abandon it in the Apostles times, when some of her children were *Detractors*, *Gluttons*, *Incestuous*, *Contentious*, *Proud*, *& Avaritious men*, as may be seene in S. *Paul's* Epistles. In these, indeed, mention is made of a *Church free from spot*, *& wrinkle*: & that we hope for in Heaven. But at present there are in the net, good & bad fish: in the feild, Corne & Darnel: in the barne, wheate,

wheate, & Chaffe: in the house, Vessells to honour, & to dishonour. Amongst the virgins, some foolish: amongst the Apostles, a *Iudas*; an *Ismael* in *Abraham's* family: an *Esau*, in *Isaacs*, a *Ruben* in *Iacob's*: an *Absalom*, in *David's*: an *Adam* in the terrestrial Paradice, & a *Lucifer* in the Celestial. All which bad men did nether excuse a separation from the *Church*, in which they lived, nor prejudice the rest, who did not approue, or abette the sins: as the *Church* hath long since declared against the *Donatists*. We professe we beleiue the *Sanctity of the Catholick Church*, which consists in her Doctrine, her Laws, her Rites, & many of her children; not all: And it is the goodnesse of God to make vs partakers of all the good workes, which any one doth; but not of the bad: For we beleiue a Communion of Saints; not of sinners; of merits; not of offenses. So the guilt of sin is confined to the person sinning: but the merits of vertuous actions spreades to all the faithfull who are in the state of grace. Wherefore we ought not to think the worse of the *Church*, for any fault committed by any of her children, seing she nether teaches, nor commands, nor approues it. But the *Protestant Church* cannot so easily cleare her selfe from such spots, as the sins of her children leaue: her Doctrine of the impossibility of God's Commandments, that we are nether the better for good, nor the worse for bad actions (which are nether meritorious, nor demeritorious in the prædestinate) & of Evangelical liberty, the roote of all Sedition, & Rebellion in *Church* & *State*, &c. These I say, & the like, having beene taught by same of her children, & never condemned by her, make her answearable for all sorts of sins, which are but the natural sequels, of those Premisses, effects of those causes, fruits of that tree, which the first *Protestants* planted, & their followers water, & cherish. In Catholicks a bad life is contrary to *Catholick Doctrine* & laws; in Protestants, it is a natural sequel of both.

I do not say this, to excuse any fault, with reason charged vpon the persons mentioned (except the gun powder plotters) or to

fore

forestall my Readers judgment, in favour of the *Church*, if those accused should be really found guilty. There is no cause for such an Apology. The faults alleadged against Mr. *Cressey* are at the worst indiscreete expressions of odjous things which he thought tru, & D. M. thinks not so. And her R. H. did shew in effect, that no *Wordly consideration should moue her to professe a Religion, of which in her conscience she was not.* Of which more hereafter. Who, but *Atheists*, & *Libertins*, can blame this? Which is only a preferring Heaven to Earth, Eternity to time, the soul to the body, God to man: & the Peace of a good conscience, before the reproach of some bad men. Those who think all Religions indifferent, & that the King is to determine which we are to follow, the *Hobbians*, may blame this; but not a Disciple of *Christ*, & his *Apostles*.

SECTION XVII.

Mr. Cressey *excused.*

1. *Whither the Kingdome may be sayd to haue taken the Covenant?*
2. *Whither the K. was the only sufferer for his Religion?*
3. *Many of the Protestant Clergy renounc't their Dignityes?*
4. *Whither the Clergy suffred for their Loyalty, or their Religion?*
5. *Of the Actings of the English Protestant Clergy in the troubles.*

1. D. M. p. 7. *It is false & injurious to say, that the* Presbiterians *did constrain the whole kingdome to forswear their* Religion: *for it must be the whole* Kingdomes *taking, & not the* Presbiterians *imposing generally of the* Covenant, *that must proue this assertion.*

Revisor. You take Mr. *Cressey's* words in a very strict sense, that

you may accuse them, & condemne him. Yet I think in good Phylosophy, & divinity too, Propositions *In materiâ contingenti*, althô they seeme *Vniversal*, are not such, but only *Indefinite*. For example: Philip. 2. 21. *All seeke their owne; not the things, which are of* Iesus-Christ. & Tit 1. 12. *The* Cretans *are always lyars, evil Beasts, slow bellyes.* These *Propositions* are as to their forme *Vniversal*, the first with a distributiue particle to Persons, *All*: the second with alike particle, of time, *Always.* Yet nether are truly *Vniversal*: not the first, for nether S. *Paul*, nor several of the Apostles then aliue, *Sought their owne.* In alike manner amongst the *Cretans* some were very good, sincere, & vertuous men. Such Propositions are frequent in common discourse: v. c. *All Spainards are Graue: All French men civil. All Italians cautious: All young men rash: All women talkatiue: All old men morose.* &c. Which are taken as tru, because commonly they are so, taken *Indefinitè.* But taken as *Vniversals*, they are false, seing several instances can be brought, in which they are not tru: & greate warinesse is necessary in applying any one of them, to particulars. This is my first Answer.

Another is, that the *Kingdome* by an ordinary figure is taken for the governing part of it: so what is decreed by that, may be sayd to be decreed by the *Kingdome.* Which is tru, thô some of this part oppose it. Thus a Peace, or Truce is sayd to be made by the Republick *Of Venice*, v. c. when the Senate decrees it, or when the major part of Senators resolue it, althô some Senators oppose it, & are for war. *Livy. Vbi semel decretum erit, omnibus id etiam, quibus ante displicuerat, pro bono, atque vtili fœdere erit defendendum. Plinius* l. 6. Epist. 13. *Quod pluribus placuit, omnibus tenendum. Dionisius Halicarnassæus: Parendum his, quæ pars maior censuerit. Even those who dislike a decree before it be made, are bound to approue it, after it is made.* Provided it containe nothing against *Conscience.* Indeed we see in all Assemblyes, where things are carryed by plurality of votes, all, even the *NOES*, are bound to approue the order, vnlesse in some cases, when they are admitted to a *Protestation.*

Now

Now the major part of the then Gouvernours of the Nation, or *Kingdome* decreed the taking of the *Covenant*: & the major & more conspicuous part of the subjects may be sayd to haue admitted that decree, althô very many, considerable both for number, & quality, by some industry shifted off the taking of it. So the Kingdome may in some sort be sayd *To impose the Covenant*: & also *To take it*. Thus we say, that *England* changed its Religion such a yeare: thô a very greate number at that time did not admit of any change. And we may say that the Oaths are imposed vpon, & taken by, the *Kingdome*: thô several refuse them. Were not Mr. *Cressey* a *Papist*, I beleiue either of these answers would suffice.

2. D. M. p. 8. His second crime, is his saying *The King was almost the only man, who remained so constant to his Religion, as to hazard for it the losse of his estate & life too. This is false, say you, for many thousands did the same.*

Revisor. In the ruin of others there was a complicancy of causes, which procured it: loyalty to their King, hatred to their persons for fyghting against them, their estates &c. For *Naboth* was not the only man, who lost his life, for his inheritance. Now there was a time, when the demands of the *Presbiterians* seemed not intollerable to the King, who only stucke at the destruction of the *Bishops*. So Mr. *Cressey* myght say, he was *Almost the only man* who suffred on the score of his *Protestant Episcopacy*. I haue not heard of very many ruined, & killed, because they *Would not renounce the Bishops*. Nether did the Rebels vse to say: *Renounce Bishops, or we will hang you*. Several sayd, renounce *Popery*, or we will kill you: & many were killed by the Rebells for not complying. But to no Protestant was giuen such sowre sawce, that I heard of.

3. D. M. p. 8. Thirdly he says: *Several of the wisest, & learnedest of the English Clergy were content to buy their security with a voluntary degrading of themselues, from their offices, & Titles. Which*, say you, *is injurious to the* Bishops.

Rev. Why the *Bishops* should be vnderstood in that proposition, I know

I know not. In our Canon law, when only an inferiour, & generical degree is named, in odious thing's (as this it in your eye) the superiour, & particular is not comprehended. [vide C. *Sedes Apostol. de Rescriptis*, & the glosse vpon it] now Mr. *Cressey* mentions only *The Clergy*, which is the lowest & most common degree. Wherefore nether *Bishops*, nor *Deanes*, nor any Person in Ecclesiastical Dignity must necessarily be comprehended. What then doth offend you, in this Proposition ? Did not several of the *English Clergy* become Catholicks ? Did not these degrade themselues *From the offices*, *& titles* which they enjoyed in the Church of England ? Could they retaine them remaining *Catholicks* ? Did not some of the English Clergy yeild to the streame, & comply with the times ? Did not some beare armes ? Did not one, & he a Metrapolitan, lay aside his Crozier, & take vp a sword ? Did not all these degrade themselues ? May not these different sort of Desertors, be named *Several of the English Clergy* ? Were it not in the book of a *Papist*, probably they myght so, & the book passe without offense.

But Mr. *Cressey* says, that he meanes the *Vniversality of the Bishops*, who seemed to degrade themselues, by not fulminating any censure against the Rebells. Answer : If he doth so, he says more, than what was necessary to make good his first Proposition. You say that censures are not a *Necessary duty of a Bishop*. So you both agree that *To censure* is a duty of a *Bishop*, in time & place : yet with this difference, that you think it is not a *Necessary duty* of a *Bishop* ; & he thinks it is : doth this diversity of Thoughts make him Criminal ? Especially being conformable to scripture. 2. Trin. 4. 2. *Reproue*, *Rebuke*, *Exhort*. Tit. 1. 13 *Rebuke them sharpely*. Did not *Christ* give power to bind, as well as to loosen ? To retaine, as well as to release ? To shut, as well as to open ? If on pressing occasions they neglect the vse of that Power *To bind*, *retaine*, *shut*, is it not as much as to renounce that Power ? & if they renounce that, do they retaine the other ? Is not Episcopacy one individual Power ?

I desire you to shew me any one *Catholick* country, where such a Rebel-

a Rebellion hapned, & all the *Bishops* remained silent. By what doth *Christ* distinguish a *Pastor* from a *Mercenary?* Ioan. 10. The first sees a *Wolf* coming, & exposes his life, for the defence of his flock: the later seing the wolf coming, runs away, & lets the wolf worry his flocke at Pleasure. Which of these two did our English Bishops imitate? But I leaue the application to the Reader.

But what can you alleadge to excuse this silence in such an occasion, as would make even the dumbe son of *Cræsus* speake? you haue three motiues: The first is, that it was not seasonable. But doth not S. *Paul* command that it be done even *Out of season?*

The second: that it would haue done no good. But that was *De futuro contingenti.* How ever in a desperate sicknesse, is it not better to apply an vncertain remedy, than none at all? Would any one haue thought that the Layty had complyed with their duty to serue the King in his wars, if they should haue remained at home, & sayd, *Our fyghting for the King will do no Good?*

The third: you would not tempt God, nor expose your order to their malice, who myght extinguish it. The others are but pretended; this is the tru reason: here the shoo wrings: you thought it good sleeping in a whole skin, & were desirous to keepe your mather's sons out of harmes way. Indeed you would secure your persons; not your order: for the Rebells had before vowed to roote out your degree; so that could not be brought into greater danger, than it was in. Wherefore your feare was for your dearly beloved persons.

D. M. p. q. His 4. crime is saying: that *Though many of the Clergy suffred, in extremity, yet it was not properly with an eye to their Religion; but to their fidelity, & loyalty to their Prince. A bold & vncharitable Assertion.*

Revisor. Why so? 1. Because says the *Doctor, they did not tell him so.* Answer: the factious Rebells did tell him so, declaring they did not persecute for Religion; but for the security of the state. Name any Protestant Parson, hanged for being such. Dr. *Hewit* was executed for ether real, or pretended crimes against the state; not for Religion. So the rest.

Your

Your other reason is because *Loyalty is a point of your Religion.* Answer: then *Susan* is innocent: & all M. *Cressey's* fault comes to this, that he thought some crimes against the state, were not against Religion. And if this be a crime, there are so many, & so greate offenders, that you will scarce find a Iury to passe vpon them.

D. M. p. q. *I think those Martyrs who suffer in defense of the V. commandment, as well as of any other.*

Rev. You will I hope find a place in your catalogue of *Martyrs* for those *Papists*, & *Iesuits*, who chose rather to dye, than *To beare false witnesse.*

5. What motiues the *Regicides* may haue had to leaue vnmolested some obscure *Parsons*, is *to* me as vncertain, as what you say p. 14. is improbable, *Viz*, that it was *Out of feare of their interest, & reputation in the countryes where they lived.* They had cut downe the stately *Cedar*, & would they sticke at a shrub? They cut off the Head of your *Church*, & would they feare the toe, or paring a nayl? They pulled downe King & Nobles, the primate & his Brethren: & would they be awed by a country Parson, scarce knowne even by name fiue miles from the place of his residence? To morrow I may beleiue this; not to day.

D. M. p. 17. *Providence seemes to haue suffred, that those heroical Confessors should be ejected out of their stations, that being dispersst over the Nation, they myght sow the seedes of* Loyalty, & Truth.

Rev. Very pretty! As if the Hay of a greate medow, were *Dispersst*, by being gathered into stackes, or the *Atlandick Ocean*, by ruming into halfe adozen *Fish-ponds.* What corner in all the Kingdome, without some of your ministry before the troubles? How then did this mysterious *Dispersion spread them?* some of them travelled, it is tru, but haply as many did so before: & what *Seeds* did they sow abroade? You your self were so wary, as not to speake of *Religion*, till you had a *Iesuits hand* & *Word*, that it would not be ill taken. A broade then you did not sow those seedes. Did you sow them in *England?* who sowed the *Seedes* of *Treason*, & falshood, of which

of which there was ſuch ſtore, that it overrun the Nation, & are not as yet weeded out? Were the *Miniſters* negligent in ſowing thoſe good ſeedes before the war? Or was their labour, & induſtry loſt? And how was it so ſucceſſefull after the wars, that it should be a work of Providence? But you thought it honourable, that Providence should appeare in the concernes of your *Miniſtry*: ſo you bring it in, without well conſidering to what intent, & purpoſe.

5. D. M. p. 18. Begins to excuſe the Bishops neglect of *Excommunication* all the time of the troubles. Vpon which I aske him ſome queſtions: Haue not the *Bishops* Power to excommunicate? Is not that Power to be vſed againſt obdurate ſinners? Were there none ſuch from 1640. till 1650? Sure there were. How comes this cenſure to be forgotten? The *Parliament*, ſay you p. 21. could not be excommunicated. Ryght; but the Perſons in, & of the *Parliament* myght: & if the cenſure did not bring them to their wits, nor reſtore them to their duty, it would haue fryghted many well meaning men, who adhered to the others innocently. Which is one effect of cenſures. 1. Trin. 5. 20. *Vt cæteri timorem habeant.*

D. M. p. 22. *We would not caſt our Pearls vnto Swine*, (*nor our holy things to dogs* p. 26.) *nor expoſe* Chriſt *to contempt*, *who ſayth*, who ſo ever deſpiſeth you, deſpiſeth me.

Rev. A preity pretext for all hen-harted Prelates! The *Apoſtles*, & *Fathers* were of a far different opinion, let one ſpeake for all: *Non calcatur qui perſecutionem patitur; ſed qui perſecutionem timendo infatuatur.* Aug. l. 1. de ſerm. D. in mon. c. 6. *Heis not deſpiſed, who ſuffers perſecution but who through Feare of perſecution is infatuated*, ſo as to neglect his duty. Had the *Apoſtles*, & primitiue *Bishops*, been ſo timorouſly prudent, *Paganiſme* had never been deſtroyed. *Semen eſt ſanguis Chriſtianorum* ſays *Tertullian: Plures efficimur, quoties metimur. Our Blond is ſeed*: our number encreaſes, by our being mowed downe with your ſwords. One graine falls, & hundreds grow vp: One Chriſtian is martyred, & thouſands of Pagans embrace his faith: & the remnant honour *Chriſt*, & his *Vicegerents*, even

when they persecute them. But this lesson is not learnt in the *Protestant Church.*

D. M. p. 22. *Thirteene Bishops made a trial of their* Authority, *when they made a solemn & publick* Protestation *against the forcible keeping of them out of the House of Peeres, & were for that impeached of* Hygh Treason, *& clapt vp in the* Tower.

Rev. What is this to the purpose? Is *Protestation* an *Episcopal Act?* Cannot meere lay men enter a *Protestation?* Is your seate in the house of *Peeres* of Divine Ryght? Shew the canon of a *General Council*, or a text of *Scripture*, that ground either of these two things. If you can shew none, no wonder the thing should not succeede, which is not of your *Ecclesiastical Function.* But how comes that concerne for your seate in Parliament, to be greater than for all other things, how sacred soever? You see Faith destroyed by *Heresy*, & you are silent: the Church torne in pieces by *Schismes*, & you are silent: the Royal Power vndermined by *Factions*, the King's sacred person endangered by *Seditions*, & affronted by *Insolent varlets*, & souls poysoned with damnable opinions, & you are silent. You are debarred sitting in the house of *Peeres*, & you cry out so loud, as to provoke the Rebells to shut you vp in a Cage. Is this seate of greater importance, than souls, than the King's person, than Royal Authority, than the Church, than Faith?

D. M. p. 24. *The* Bishops *thought they were obliged not to draw that sword of* Excommunication, *to cut nothing but the Ayre with it, or by striking on a Rocke, to blunt, or breake the Edge of it.*

Rev. A straw is as good, as such a sword, which must strike only the Ayre, or it will fly in pieces. Oh, but we must not strike *Rockes.* Are then all the children of your *Church* as insensible of your censures, as a Rocke, of the stroke of a sword? If so: whose is the fault, but yours, who haue the breeding of them?

D. M. p. 25. *By* Excommunication *they had exposed not only their* Persons; *but their* Order *it self to be ruined: for who can tell, whither those, who imprisoned some for the* Protestation, *would not haue taken*

away

way their liues, if they had interdicted the houses of Parliament, *and excommunicated their adherents. And then what would haue become of the* Episcopal Order *it self of our* Church? Rome *would giue vs no* Bishops, Lutherans & Calvinists *can giue none: other Churchs are too far off.* Tarbox.

Revisor. Did I not know your intention, I should think you prevaricated, your reasons are so far from giving satisfaction to a *Christian*, so contrary to what hath been practiced. Nothing, but temporal motiues, & humane respects in all your discourse. Was not the whole *Catholick* nay *Christian Church*, in as greate danger when all the *Bishops* in the world were in *Hierusalem*? And did this make them be silent? Quite contrary, they resolved to preach on, & beseeched God to confirme them in this resolution. *Behold their threatnings*, sayd they Act. 4. 29. *& grant vnto thy servants, that with all boldnesse, they speake thy word.*

D. M. p. 29. *We think the Power of* Excommunication *in the* Church *to be more then either a* Political, *a* Parliamentary, or *a meerly* Ecclesiastical constitution, *as being an* Ordinance, *&* Institution *neither of the* State, *or of the* Church; *but of* Christ *himself.*

Rev. It is not worth the while, to examin whence you haue it, when many doubt whither you haue it at all: & this neglect of vsing it, in such vrgent occasions, confirmes them in that doubt. The same of other questions, which pa. 29. You propose: why the Pope did excommunicate *Henry VIII.* Why not *Charles V.* Which are nothing to our purpose. I will only, say that if the Pope had no better, nor other grounds, than you alleadge, his case is hard to be excused.

D. M. p. 32. Cressey *May confesse truly, that this whole passage was put into his* Book *by another hand, without his knowledge, & that as he was forced to owne it at first, so he was not permitted to retract, or correct it, in his second edition.*

Rev. Here are three odious *Accusations.* 1. Against the *Benedictins*, of corrupting another man's workes, making him say, what he never sayd.

The 2. against Mr. *Cressey* of owning a thing as his owne, which he knew was not his owne; & was to boote false.

The 3 against them all againe, for not permitting that vntruth to be corrected: whereas Mr *Cressey* says expressely *He would haue corrected them, but his corrections come too late to the printer.* He sent them than to the printer, & this, he would not havedone, but by consent of his superiours. Wherefore they consented to that correction: contrary to what you say.

The meane while these Crimes are charged by you vpon that ancient graue order, & not a word of proofe offred. I will not say they are *Calumnyes*; but I desire you to Act the God father, & giue them convenient names.

SECTION XVIII.

Revision of the Sermon nou. 5.

1. *Festiual days for Thanks giving good; yet sometimes abused.*
2. *That of the 5. of nou. notoriously.*
3. *No seditious Doctrines in the Church of Rome.*
4. *Of the gunpowder Plotters.*
5. *Of the penal Laws against Papists.*

1. TO returne thanks to Almyghty God, for the Benefits received of him, especially when they are greate, & signal deliveryes, is a duty enjoined by the law of nature: & that some singular favours should be acknowledged with annual solemnityes, is prescribed both in the old, & new law. Such were in the old, the *Phase*, the *Phurim*, the *Encænia*, the *New moones*, & the *Sabboth*. In the new, *Christ masse*, *Easter*, *withsuntide*, & the *sundays*.

That these *Anniversary Feasts* were gratefull to God, when duly kept, is evident, seing he commanded them; exacted their being kept:

kept: checked, & punisht such as broke, or prophaned them, by any servile worke. Yet that they were sometimes offensiue to him, is as evident as any thing in *Scripture. Amos* 5. 21. *I hate, I despise your feast days, & I will not smell in your solemne Assemblyes.* And *Amos* 8. 10. *I will turne your Feasts into mourning.* And *Malachy* 2. 3. *I will corrupt your seede, & spread dung vpon your faces, even the dung of your solemne Feasts, & it shall take you away with it.* There is then *dung* in *solemne Feasts*, for which God *hates*, & *despises* them: for which he *will turne them into mourning*, which he *will spread* on men's faces, & destroy them: as well as *Flowers* or *Fruit* gratefull to God, & men. What is this *Dung*? What the *Fruit*, or *Flowers?*

The *Feasts* are as pleasant as *Flowers, or Fruit*, when they are spent in considering the danger men were in, their inability to avoyde it, & Gods mercys, in discovering, & disappointing it. Then than king God, for his helpe in over coming it, & praying him to continu his Protection. To make themselues worthy of this Blessing, men must be sorry for their offences, & resolue not to offend againe. These Feasts so kept would entayle the like Blessings vpon vs. But they become as odious as *Dung*, when they are occasions not to prayse God; but curse his servants: when men, in them, in lieu of magnifying his mercy, provoke his justice, & deserue the mischeif they haue escaped by vncharitable invectives against jnnocents, to satisfy their Passion. What is this but to turne *God's Blessings into curses*: to dry vp the fountaine of his mercy; & stir vp his Anger: & to draw vpon their heads those, or greater punishments, than those they escaped? In fine, to make themselues vnworthy of his Protection?

2. How little *Fruit*, & what a prodigious quantity of this *Dung* is found in your *Gun powder solemnity*, is evident to any man, who sees the sermons made on that occasion. This, which J now *Review*, containes 37. pages: yet all it containes of the delivery from the plot it self, myght be sayd in one. The rest (excepting some commonly knowne Truths at the beginning, as that *There is a God*, &c.) is spent in charging that horrid plot on Persons certainly, or at least probably

probably innocent, & our Religion it selfe. Now if you, D. *Morley*, one of the most moderate of your coate, in presence of his Majesty, [whose mercifull disposition, & aversion to violent courses, is knowne] haue so much of this *Dung*, what can we guesse of your hotheaded *Prophets* amongst their furious blind Zealots?

And now, o ye Preists (Parsons) *this commandment is for you.* (I vse the words of *Malachy*. 2.) *If ye will not heare, & if ye will not lay to hart, to giue glory to my name, sayth the Lord of Hosts, I will even send a curse vpon you, & I will curse your Blessings: yea I haue cursed them already, because you do not lay to hart. Behold I will reproue your seede* [your whole *Ministry*] *& spread dung vpon your faces, even the dung of your solemne Feasts* [5. *noven*] *& it shall take you away with it.* Which words are soe cleerly verifyed in our days, of your *Gunpowder Feast* in *England*, that they seeme not an *Obscure Prophecy* of a thing to come; but a Relation of a thing past, or description of one present. How little you glorify God's name, on this day, I haue sayd already. That God *Hath cursed these your Blessings, & spread the dung of this solemnity vpon the face of the whole English Protestant Church*, is evident: for from the yeare 1641. that fyery Zeale against *Popery*, which your selues had kindled, & entertained, fell on your owne Church, as *Popish, & tooke it away with it*, & *Monarchy* also: leaving scarce any hopes of restoring either. And againe with in these last fiue yeares how neere it brought both again to subversion, & vtter ruin, you cannot but know. And how greate was the danger of this Feast *Being turned into mourning*, as *Amos* foretold c. 8.10. is evident, whence our vigilant Magistrates were moved to forbid *Bone fires*, those ordinary signes of joy: as the best meanes to prevent some dismall effects of that *Malice*, which you of the Ministry keepe still vp at heygth, althô you haue found it fatal to both *Church* & *State*.

Yet I am not convinced, that *Prohibiting bone fires* is a remedy proportioned to the evil, that is feared, or rather felt, as long as you by your reproaches, & invectiues, are permitted to entertaine

that

that hatred of *Popery*: it is only to cut off a branch, & leaue the tree, to skin a wound, & leaue the Arrow head in it: not to quench; but to cover a fire, which when least expected will breake out into new flames. For if you are permitted to sound the Allarme, what wonder those who deferre too much to your words should take it, & being fryghted out of their wits, by your representation of their danger, they mistake a *Troyan* for a *Grecian*, & some blows levelled at *Papists*, fall on *Papists in Masquerade*? In fine your *Gunpowder sermons preach the People into gunpowder: & then a little sparke is enough to set them on fire, & blow all to pieces.* And at whose dore must this lye, but yours, who dispose all to it?

One observation more, & I passe this point. Factious men, who make vse of your labours to your destruction, are greate proficients in the Art of promoting mischeife. Forty yeares a goe it cost them much labour, mony, bloud, & time, to get their armed *Mirmidons* about the Kings person: within these four yeares, few houres were enough to bring 20000. armed men. to *Temple Barre*, neere the *King's Palace*: & who knows but the next attempt will bring them to, or within his gates. *Deus omen avertat*, say I, as well as you. But humanely speaking, that can scarce be avoyded, without God's opening your eyes to see the mischeife, you promote, or stirring vp publicke Authority to stop your mouths. Otherwise, *You conceine chaffe, you bring forth stubble, your spirit, as fire, will devour you.* Isayas 33. 11. Now to your sermon.

In your 16. first pages I see little to the purpose. The greatest part is *De communi Sanctorum*, appliable to other things, mingled with some slips, through inadvertency: such I take that to be, p. 13. S. *Paul saw it with his owne eyes*: when he says himself, 1. cor. 1. 11. *He heard it from those of Chloe.*

3. D. M. p. 17. *This horrid conspiracy, to which the Actors were prompted by some* Doctrines *of their Religion.*

Rev. That it was a *Horrid conspiracy*, I grant; but not, that the Doctrines of our *Religion* prompted the Actors vnto it. Let experience

rience decide the cause. What Kings more absolute in their Dominions, then *Catholicks*? In England when were our Kings more honoured, & readily obeyed, by their subjects, than when *Papists*? when more beloved by their freinds, and Allyes, when more feared by their Enemyes, than when *Papists*? *Popery* teachs to giue every one his due: to God, what is Gods, & to *Cæsar*, what is his: that is, it teaches to obey both *Prelate* & *Prince*, both *spiritual* & *temporal Magistrate*. Whereas your Reformation quite cast off obedience to the *Prelate*, & so weakened that to the *Prince*, that this broke too. And althô you haue endeavoured to piece it againe, yet the common voice says, that without a dose of *Popery*, or *Popish principles*, it can never arriue to its former vigour. So different are the judgments of the world from your pretences! But what are these *Doctrines*?

D. M. p. 19, *That of the* Popes supremacy *not* of order, *or* precedency *Only*; b*ut of* Authority, *&* jurisdiction.

Rev. That supremacy had been acknowledged 1000. yeares, & yet *Monarchy* remained in its vigour: & so it continues in *Spaine*, & *France*, & *Germany*, without any bad effect to *Monarchy*. But you lay the faults of your *Reformation* at our dore. Then you cite some hard opinions out of *Bellarmin*, & *Aug. Steucus*, who being no Rules of our Faith, I passe by them.

D. M. p. 21. *The Clergy was forbidden to marry that they myght haue no tye to their country: & exempted from secular jurisdiction, that it myght depend only on the Pope.*

Rev. You speake more dogmatically, than the *Pope*, for in doctrinal points, he giues a Reason, & you giue none. You may find other motiues for these two points, if you consult our *Divines*, or *Controvertists*.

D. M. p. 22. *Oaths cannot bind them to their* Allegiance *Because* 1. *they take them with* Æquivocation. 2. *The Pope can dispense in them.* 3. *They keepe no faith with Hereticks.*

Rev. Such stuffe myght passe in *Oates's narratiue*, or raylng I. *Philips*,

Philips, before the Rabble; but ſcarce in one of your degree before ſuch an Auditory. If *Oaths* to vs are ſuch *Cobwebs*, why do ſo many of vs looſe their Eſtates, their Libertys, & their Liues, rather than take ſome? Why doth the Parliament take the Paines to frame, & impoſe them? You contradict experience, & I feare, your owne Conſcience.

D. M. p. 23. *Another horrid Doctrine, is the obligation of Preiſts, to conceale what they heare in* Confeſſion. And you mention *Clement*, & *Ravaillac*.

Rev. You myght with as much reaſon, haue mentioned *Brutus* & *Pauſanias*: for it doth not appeare that ether of theſe two ever diſcovered their deſigne in *Confeſſion*. The ſecret of *Confeſſion* may bring a Ruffian to diſcover his damnable intention to a *Preiſt*, by whome he may be diverted, or the miſcheife prevented: & Divines teach how, without breaking the ſeale of Confeſſion. But it giues no advantage to a *Preiſt* to communicate bad deſignes, becauſe the obligation of ſecrecy binds not the *Penitent*.

D. M. p. 24. *It is not enough to ſay, theſe are not* Doctrines *of the* Church of Rome; *but only of ſome particular* Doctors *of it: becauſe they never were condemned by the repreſentatiue Body of that Church*, &c.

Rev. A diſcourſe much below your ſelf, & your Auditory, yet you repeate it againe p. 30. What obligation is there, that if one do a thing contrary to his duty, all thoſe of his Communion muſt by ſome publicke act declare againſt it. Doth a man ſuſpect his ſon, of taking a purſe, if another doth ſo? Or his wife of being vnfaithfull to him, becauſe his neyghbour's wife is ſo? Or you & your brethren, to be in a readineſſe to take vp Armes againſt the King, becauſe a *Bishop* did ſo? Becauſe that man's ſon, or wife, or the *Bishops* never declared their abhorrence, of thoſe ſeveral Crimes?

Moreover ſome of the Doctrines, you mention, are cenſured by our Church, in *Santarelli*, & *Becanus*. In France, & Rome it ſelf: which you knew, & therefore ſay *They were not condemned by the repreſentatiue body of the Church*, that is, a general Council. But if

you reade the last Chapter of S. Austins fourth book *Contra duas Epistolas Pelagianorum*, you will find that generall Councils are not always necessary to condemne emergent errours, that many more haue beene condemned out of, than in Councils; that without an absolute necessity [all other meanes fayling] the Church vses not to haue recours to a general Council. Indeed were it not so, such Councils must ether be perpetual, & so the cheife Pastors would be always absent from their flocks, or be so freqnent, that they would scarce ever reside with it. Wherefore God hath appointed in the Church for ordinary & more frequent occasions inferiour Tribunals, some of which haue declared already their dislike of some of these Doctrines: others they leaue, as likely to wither of themselues, *Sicut fœnum tectorum*, as hay on the house top: & some it may be are left, as not being legally knowne to those Tribunalls. How ever ether there is, or is not, an obligation to condemne all bad Doctrines? If there is none, why do you blame our Church for omitting it? If there is one, how can you excuse your owne Church, which never complyed with that Duty? In reality there is an obligation, which being a positiue precept, obliges in time & place; not alwais: & is so kept by vs; not at all by you.

D. M. p. 25. *Bishop Andrews tells vs, that Paul* IV. *offred to confirme all that Q.* Elisabeth *had done* in Church *affayres, vpon condition she would owne his* supremacy.

Rev. This requires abetter proofe, than the bare word of one interessed man. How ever if it were so, the guilt of *Schisme* sticks closer to you: & you may see how much you were mistaken, when you told F. *Darcy* at *Brusselles*, that one *Side was resolved before hand to relax nothing*. But it is an ordinary custome amongst you, to make vs hold contradictory things, as they serue your turne.

D. M. p. 26. *The easterne schisme was caused by the Pope's assuming the title of vniversal Bishop: & of being Head of the whole Church.*

Rev. That cannot be: for the Pope never tooke the title of *Vniversal Bishop*. And that other, *Head of the Church*, was acknowledged by the

by the 2. *General Council: you preside over vs, as a Head over its members.* Says that *Council.*

D. M. p. 27. & 28. *Cates by sayd this*, & F. *Garnet sayd that*, &c.

Rev. Iust the stile of *Oates's narratiue*, & myght serue as a *Modele* of it.

D. M. p. 30. *They suffer* Garnet, *&* Oldcorne *to be put into the Catalogue of* Martyrs, *by the* Iesuits.

Rev. If they do so, it is because they judge them Innocent of the *Treason*, for which they suffred; not that they like the *Treason* it self. Thus several haue written in defence of some Persons lately accused of *Treason*, beleiving them to be innocent of it, who hate *Treason* more hartily, than ether *Oates*, or *Shaftesbury*, the *grand promoters* of that Accusation.

D. M. p. 31. *Beware of false Prophets, who come to you in sheepe's cloathing; but are inwardly wolues, nay ravening wolues.*

Rev. The same I say: yet still I wish it were not in the Power of every malicious man, to call *Wolf* & then all the dogs in the country shall be set on a *Sheepe*, & worry it. Which hath beene lately done on this side the line, to the astonishment of the world, & no little discredit of our Nation.

D. M. p. 32. *It is not their persecution, but our owne preservation that we contend for.*

Rev. The law of nature obliges you to seeke *Self preservation*: but *Prudence* must guide you in the choice of proper meanes to find it. And *Experience* is the best rule of *Prudence*: & this demonstrates, that *Persecution of Papists*, is the way to *Ruin*; not to *Preserue* your selues. For about 70. yeares, through the mercy of our *Kings* we haue had but two *Persecutions* of *Papists*, & both opened a dore to Factious Rebells, who the first time ruined both *Church*, & *State*: & the second time brought both to the brink of a precipice, & downe both had gon, had there not been put a stop to the preceedings against *Papists*. So the *Persecution of Papists* is such a remedy to your fainting Church, as cutting his throate is to a man in an Ague.

Dic mihi, num furor est, ne moriare mori?

Will any man in his wits, prescribe such physicke?

D. M. p. 34. *I will add for justifying the laws made against* Papists, *that if they seeme to haue a watchfull eye, & hold a stricter hand over them in jealous times, they must thank themselues, who refuse to take, & the Pope, who forbids them to take the Oaths.*

Rev. I wish you had explicated, what you meane by *Iealous times?* Whither such as are occasioned by some Actions, or designes of *Papists*, against your *Church*, or *State?* Or without any cause, besides the phancy of some melancholy Parson, or the *Calumnyes* of some such Flagitious wretches, as of late appeared on the *English Stage?* If your jealousyes are are of the first sort, no body will blame your severity, vpon the guilty Persons. If they haue no other ground but the dreames of a fancifull Parson, or the word, & Oath, of an *Oates*, or a *Bedlow*, who would starue or be hanged, if by such a tricke they did not get a meales meate, and their necke out of a halter, by a Pardon: I leaue you to judge, whither this doth justify your strict hand; & not rather aggravate it. A wise man sayd: *England is in a strange condition! For if any man in the Parliament do but cry, Popery, they will act, & decree, as if they were besides themselues.* Is this a laudable disposition of the *Body Politick?* Would our taking the *Oaths* cure this distemper, when you your self in this very sermon tell the world, that no *Oaths* can bind vs? Me thinks an vnblemisht loyalty both acting, & suffring, as is our duty to the Royal Authority in such variety of hard times, as we haue seene, myght be a better assurance, than such *Cobwebs*, as you describe them.

D. M. p. 38. *The Church of Rome vses greater severity in* Spaine, *&* Jtaly, &c.

Rev. We are very thankfull to his Majesty for *The grace he shews vs, either in quite suspending, or abating the rigour of the law*: & we acknowledge it as an act of *Mercy*. yet giue me leaue to tell you, that our case in *England*, is far different from that of *Protestants* either in *Spaine*, or *Italy*: we brought *Christianity* to the *English Nation*: your *Bishops*, & *Preists*, your *Hierarchy* & *Orders*, if you haue any,

any, you haue them from vs. Your *Churchs* we built, & founded, your *Celledges* & *Vniversityes* are our *Donations:* Your *Canon*, & *Civil law*, your *Sacred*, & *prophane learning* are the product of our studyes. The very *Rites*, & *ceremonyes*, which you vse, you borrowed from vs. Which of all these things did *Protestants* bring, & settle in *Italie*, or *Spaine*? If none; then certainly the case of *Catholicks* in *England*, is not the same, with that of *Protestants*, in *Catholick* countryes.

D. M. p. 38. *Let me intreate you all to joine with me in this short prayer.*

Rev. We willingly giue God thanks for preserving the Nation from ruin: & pray him to continu his protection to it: & that *He will giue our Dread soveraigne along life, a peaceable reigne, a wise Council, faithfull Ministers, stout souldiers, & an obedient, contented, & united people, without those groundlesse animositys, which you of the Ministry foment. Amen.*

SECTION XIX.

A Revision of the Letter to her R. H.

1. *The publishing of this Letter vnexpected.*
2. *What kind of Directors are the Ministers?*
3. *The report of the change of her R. H.*
4. *Motiues alleadged to retaine her in the Protestant Religion.*
5. *Spiritual state of the Protestant Church.*

1. I Was very much surprized, to see this letter made publick, much more, that is was by your order, by reason of the character you bore, of *Confessor* to her R. H. For a far different reason, there ought to be as greate a freedome of communication betwixt *Confessor*, & *Penitent*, in matters of *Conscience*, as to the soul, as betwixt

betwixt *Man*, & *Wife*, as to the *Body*. Which liberty is much checeed, with the thought, that such things may some day become publicke. The people of *Athens* would not let *Philip* of *Macedon's* letters to his wife *Olimpias* be opened, thô he were an Enemy, as thinking the converse betwixt such persons, sacred. With more reason ought those betwixt *Confessor*, & *Penitent*, be looked on as such. But it seemes in the *Protestant Church* nether secret is regarded: for that betwixt *Man* & *Wife* was broken by order of *Parliament*, for the printing the letters of king *Charles I.* to the Queene, & you, a father of the *Protestant Church* publish those betwixt your *Penitent*, & you. And J heare that some persons of your *Communion* haue found, that they had not made their *Confessions* themselues to *Mute fishes*. Witnesse Capt. *Hinde*.

Catholickes haue indeed printed a letter of a *Preist* to my Lord of *Stafford*, & something written as is beleived by her R. H. but nether of these comes home to the point of this letter. For what was written by her R. H. was probably designed to be seene, at least it was not written to her *Confessor*: nor was that letter to my Lord of *Stafford*, by his *Confessor*, it myght, & probably did come from one, who never saw him, nor knew of him, but onely that he was preparing for Death.

Another reason, why I was surprized at the syght of this letter, is that it doth in a manner confirme the Report of her being a *papist*. Now this lady being by alliance entred into the *Royal Family*, & making a very eminent figure in it, I thought shee should haue beene partaker of that priviledge, that none should publish their being *Papists*: for if this be *Treason* by law, when layd of the head of that Family, it ought to be held a hainous offence, when spoken of others. Besides this, we learne in Tobie, 12. 11. That it is *Good to reveale the secrets of God; & to conceale those of the King*. So that whereas Divines are permitted to dine as deepe as they can into Divine mysterys, as to those of the King they are to remember, that *Qui scrutator est Majestatis, opprimetur a gloriâ*, *He that pryes into Majesty*

Majesty shall be oppreſt with glory Prou. 25. 27. Death to the foole hardy.

2. The booke called *Anti Haman* p. 309. hath theſe words: *There ſeemes to be as much difference, betwixt the ſpiritual food, which ſouls receiue in the* Catholick Church, *& that of* Proteſtants, *as there* is betwixt *the nourriture a child receives ſucking a breaſt, ſtretched with milke, & that he gets, by ſucking a moiſtned finger.* We haue an occaſion here to ſee whither this judgment be well grounded.

Two things are remarkable in the inſtructions, which Miniſters giue to the ſouls vnder their direction, as appeares by their ſermons, & ſpiritual bookes. 1. A horrour, & hatred of *Popery.* 2. A ſlyght touch of ſome holeſome *Catholick Truths*, yet ſo handled, as not to moue conſiderably the ſoul, for feare it moue them too far. For example, they ſpeaking of ſome former ſins, the ſorrow for them, the purpoſe of amendment: the preventing God's judgments, by judging our ſelves, & appeaſing his wrath by Penitencial workes, they do it well; yet knowing that thoſe points are meere *Popery*, to prevent their paſſing over to it they adde an Antidote, which deſtroyes all they had ſayd. One inſtance shall ſuffice. Dr *Hewit, Repentance, & Converſion* p. 51. hath theſe words: *We muſt confeſſe to men, & that both privately, & publickly, according to the quality of the ſin,* (This is catholick Doctrine: now he corrects it) *For though we condemne* Auricular Confeſſion, *as a trick of ſtate Policy; yet we allow, & exhort all Chriſtians to a tru, voluntary, & ſincere Confeſſion of their ſins to the Bishop, & ſuperintendents of the Church.* Thus he. Now what is *Private Confeſſion*, but *Auricular Confeſſion*? Yet to the one he exhorts; the other he condemnes: or rather he approues, & condemnes the ſame thing vnder different names. And what is this, but to build with one hand, & pull downe with the other? to plant, & roote vp, the ſame thing? To teach in Churchs, as tru *Proteſtant evidences* depoſe in Courts plaine *Downe ryght contradictions?*

Now what can a ſoul do, hearing this, if she be truly deſirous of ſalvation? Practice thoſe Truths? They bring her to *Popery*? Then they cannot ſeriouſly practice what you teach. This inward combat

combate seldome ceases, till they leaue the *Protestant Communion*: for either they become immediatly *Papists*, if the loue of vertu overcomes: or *Presbiterians*, if the hatred of *Papists* prevailes, by the helpe of a *Morose nature*. Thus the sureſt tyes to *Protestancy* seeme to be, 1. a careleſſeneſſe of what is to come in the next world, 2. a Presumption of God's goodneſſe, & 3. Temporal motiues of all sizes. All which are insignificant to a soul, that prefers her eternal concerne, before her temporal, & resolues to advance in vertu an *Earth*, that shee may be more gratefull to her celestial spouse in Heaven.

3. For this reason the report of the change in *Religion*, of her R. H. easily found credit with me. Of which report, you speake p. 4. & 5. God had giuen her a serious desire to serue him, as he would be served. I heard she was earneſt in pursuing what she thought was for his glory, attentiue in her Devotions, & exact in performing what seemed to be the will of God, & for the good of her soul: & that though her Fortune was exceeding greate, yet she would rather forgoe it all, then hazard her soul: that Jewell being too precious, to be compensated with any thing. God had *Giuen her an extraordinary good vnderstanding*, say you p. 14. with which she could easily discerne betwixt what was *Tru*, & what onely *Seemed to be so*. Whence without any helpe of Bookes, or instructions of men, by only Hearing the discourse of *Religion* (which is the most common in *England*, & will be so, till men talke themselues either out of all *Religion*, or into a good one, either into *Atheisme*, or *Popery*) she myght easily discover, that the devil was not so vgly, as he was painted: that somethings were charged on vs, which we did not hold: & that what we really taught, was not Blame worthy: soe on both sides we were jnnocent. And probably she myght declare so much, being vnwilling to heare vs wronged. Which gaue you occasion to say, p. 4. that shee *Declared in favour* of *Papists*, & grounded that Report, of her being one.

Then you spend several pages in proving how fatal a like Report had

had beene to her Father-in-law, K. *Charles I.* & what prejudice it had like to haue done to *Charles II.* altho both were innocent of that Crime, & averse to the *Religion*. Which confirmes what I sayd, how dangerous it is to entertaine that animosity against *Popery*, which enables knaues to compasse the ruin of honest men, even the King himself, with only traducing him, or them, as *Papists*, how innocent soever they be, & averse to that Religion.

D. M. p. 12. *It is Impossible to silence this Report* (of your being a *Papist*) *vnlesse you your self appeare in it, & vpon all occasions declare your detestation of it.* &c.

Rev. How insignificant this remedy would haue proved, appeares by its successe in the late King's time: Whose declarations of that nature, even at the *Communion*, could not silence his Enemyes, nor check a like report.

D. M. p. 15. *None shall ever be able to proue, that either we omit any thing necessary to salvation: or teach any thing destructiue to it.*

Rev. Your *Schisme* is destructiue to *Salvation*. It is vndeniable that *Schismaticks* remaining such cannot besaved; *They shall nothaue God for their father, who haue not the Church for their mother.* S. Cyprian. And you are in a *Schisme*. I myght alleadge several other things destructiue to *Salvation*: but this one is enough.

D. M. p. 17. & 18. *The Papists say there is no salvation, out of their Church. The* Donatists *sayd so too. And was it not for that, saying so, that they were pronounced Hereticks?*

Revisor: Here are three grosse mistakes, of which I haue spoken sec. 4. The 1. that the donatists sayd there was no salvation out of their Church. Their grande errour was, that the Church was lost by communicating with a sinner. All their other errours were but sequels of this: viz! that there was no Church, but theirs, the rest of the Christians communicating with Cecilianus, who had delivered vp the holy bookes. 2. That there was no valid Baptisme but in their Communion. 3. That the son, was lesser than the father, & the Holy ghost, than the son. See S. Austin l. de Hereticis ad

Quod vult Deum §. 69. & Epi. Baronij ad annu Dom. 321. n. 4. For these errours the donatists were tru Herticks. But for saying, that Heresy destroys salvation, they could not be Hereticks, vnlesse you will make S. *Athanasius* one, who says in his creede: *Quam*, fidem, *nisi quisque integram inviolatamque servaverit, absque dubio in æternum peribit.* No hopes of salvation, where any point of Faith is denyed.

The 2. *That they were pronounced Hereticks for saying so.* They were pronounced *Hereticks* for saying other things: as I haue shewne.

The 3. that they were held for *Hereticks.* The *Catholick Church* held them at first for *Scismaticks*, & such they were; but not for *Hereticks.* The *Catholicks* exacted nothing of them, but that they should joine Communion with them: they offred to that intent, that in those cittyes, which had two *Bishops*, one of each Communion, the surviver, which soever it was, should governe alone the *Diocese*, that by that meanes the *Schisme* myght be extinguisht. A condition never offred to any *Heretick*, or *Hereticks* what soever. At last indeed they turned tru *Hereticks*, as I sayd, on another score.

D. M. p. 19. *For you to conclude in favour of* Popery, *without hearing* Protestants, *is that which cannot be done either in* Equity, or Conscience.

Rev. She did not conclude for one side, without hearing the other, She had heard *Protestants* from her jnfancy, & had weyghed maturely what they could say for themselues, or against *Popery.* It is wonderfull, that a short Conference with some *Papist*, [it could be no more, if there were so much] should be of force sufficient to roote vp all those prejudices against God's *Church*, which you so carefull instill to those vnder your conduct, althô they had bin confirmed by long practice, & reiterated Acts contrary to the *Catholick Faith*: & all these backed with almost the greatest temporal interest in the world: for on the one side, she saw Honour, Riches, & the probable expectation of our Imperial crowne; on the other, Reproaches, Calumnyes, disgrace, & probably a tragical End, for such

ſuch had been the fate of her Father-in-law indeed; & what miſery, or vnjuſtice is ſo evident, ſo greate, as a *Papiſt* may not feare from a *Tru Proteſtant*? But *Magna veritas, & prævalet*: *Truth* ſeconded by God's interiour grace, & aſſiſted by her generous reſolution, never to admit the whole world into conſideration, when her ſoul was concerned, overcame all thoſe difficultyes. With this *Truly Heroical* reſolution you acquaint vs. For you ſay to her.

D. M. p. 21. *You your ſelfe haue told me more then once, (even ſince this falſe report hath beene rayſed of you) that you would not do any thing, whereby you myght ſeeme to be of a* Church, *or* Religion, *which you are not of indeed; no not for any wordly conſideration whatſoever.* And p. 22. *you are wont to ſay, that no wordly either* Advantage, *or* Prejudice, *is to be conſidered, when the gaining of the One, or the avoyding of the Other, comes into competition with the hazarding, or ſecuring of our ſpiritual, & everlaſting jntereſt of our ſouls: & conſequently, that if you were convinced there were no* Salvation *to be had, but in the* Church of Rome, *no conſideration either of* Loſſe, *or of* Danger *here in this world, you myght incur by it, should keepe you from it.*

Rev. Out of theſe truly *Chriſtian* Reſolutions, often declared to you, I gather many material points, either vnknowne before, or not ſufficiently knowne.

1. That her R. H. was really enclined to be a *Catholick*. So that *Report* was grounded.

2. That you knew this inclination.

3. That you endeavoured to divert her from it, alleadging cheifly temporal intereſt, to divert her from becoming a *Papiſt*. This I gather out of thoſe declarations, which she ſo often made: & out of this very letter, which containes little, if any thing at all elſe.

4. That either you, which I do not beleiue, or ſome other *Proteſtant*, adviſed her to diſſemble in matter of *Religion*, & profeſſe her ſelf a *Proteſtant*, thô she were not ſo. What other occaſion could she haue to make that declaration, that *She would not do any thing to ſeeme to be of a Church of which she was not*, for all the world?

Lastly, that she was too generous to be fryghted with such Bug beares. When her soul lay at stake: knowing full well, it *Would availe her nothing to gaine the whole world, if she lost that.* Mar. 8. 36.

5. Thus this letter confirmes what was sayd, but not commonly beleived, of the Religion in which her R. H. dyed, that she truly was a *Catholick*, or as you call vs, a *Papist*: for you owne her inclination that way, & you had little to alleadge to divert her from it, but temporal interest: which was as little able to retaine her, as a cobweb to hold a Lion: so it is impossible to misse in the conjecture of the event.

But what judgment will the world make of your *Church*, out of this letter? The concerne you writ for, was as greate almost as could occurre, the retaining within your Communion a person, as considerable almost, as any whatsoever, a person worthily esteemed as greate for her qualifications of mind, as to vertu, & vnderstanding, as for her dignity in the Kingdome: a person, who was a greate ornament to your Church, nay a Piller of it. So no doubt but all industry was vsed to prevent her leaving you: & that whatsoever your Art, your wit, & learning could doe, was employed to that intent, & we may guesse, that as the cause was common, so the concurrence was: & therefore we may conjecture, that all the nerues of the *Protestant Church* joined to giue this Blow. Yet how weake, how inconsiderable is it!

And is then your *Glorious Apostolical reformed Church come to this*? Haue you no motiues, to commend her *Communion*, & retaine pious souls in it, but *Temporal?* will these weygh downe in the scales of reason all considerations of *Eternity*? And if they should be judged weyght, by men, will God judge so too? At the greate day, will it be a sufficient excuse for *Schisme*, & *Heresy*, to say: I was affrayd of loosing my estate, of hindring my fortune, of offending my freinds, of giving advantage to my Enemys? Will not *Christ* answer. Seing *You haue disowned me*, & my *Church*, *before men*, *I will disowne you before my father?*

I will

I will not deny, but you haue given ſatisfaction, as to what concernes your ſelf, that you are a *Proteſtant*. Yet I muſt profeſſe, you giue little ſatisfaction, as to your *Church*. Nay I do declare, that I would never deſire other, nor better grounds to vindicate the Truth of *Catholick Religion*, & the neceſſity of living in the *Communion* of the *Catholick Church*, than what this letter affords. For by it, we may gather the condition of the *Proteſtant Church* to be like that of *Laodicea*, Apoc. 3. 17. *Wretched, & miſerable, & poore, & blind, & naked.* I hartily wish you & thoſe of your ranke, were truly ſenſible of this Truth, & that you made a ryght vſe of it, by ſeeking ways to returne to the Communion of the *Catholick Roman Church*: & ſo put an end to this horrid *Schiſme*. Though the difficultyes to be overcome were greate, yet greate difficultyes ought not to fryght vs from ſo greate, ſo neceſſary a good, as that of the *Peace* of the *Church*. But in reality they are leſſe, then apprehended, which you muſt ſay, if you beleiue, what you report after *Biſhop Andrews*, that the Pope was willing to confirme all, that Q. *Elizabeth* had done in matter of *Religion*, provided she would acknowledge his *Supremacy*. This is then the grand, nay the only obſtacle. Now all, who haue been converſant in Catholick countryes, & ſee their cuſtomes, even where that *Supremacy* is acknowledged, ſee cleerly, that this is no ſuch formidable thing, as to excuſe, & juſtify a ſeparation: & by conſequence can be no juſt hindrance of *Peace*. which the *God of Peace* grant vs: & giue all *Schiſmaticks* a tru deſire of. *Amen.*

SECTION XX.

A Reviſion of his Letter to a Preiſt.

WHo this *Regular Preiſt* is, you do not tell vs; yet what you ſay, of him, & he of himſelf, deſcribe him by infallible notes. You endeavour to proue in this letter to him, three things.

1. *That*

1. *That being so perswaded, as he was, he was bound in* Conscience *to leaue the* Communion *of the* Roman Church.

2. *That he was bound to joine* Communion, *with the* Protestant Church *of* England.

3. *That he was bound to do it out of hand.*

Which Propositions are built one vpon another, the third on the second, & this on the first. Which being *Conditional*; not *Absolute*: supposing his *Present perswasion*, we must see what that is: & according to this *Meridian* we must calculate his *Duty*.

What this poore man's *Perswasion* is, (if he haue any setled) is hard to judge of. He hath vowed *Obedience* to his *Regular Superiour*; & will not keepe it. He hath vowed *Poverty*, & breakes that vow. He professe the *Catholick Faith*, & beleiues it full of *Errors*, nay *Heresyes*. He says, he will remaine in the *Communion* of the *Roman Catholick Church*, & yet beleiues her to be *Heretick*, & *Schismatick*. He hath beene ordred backe to his *Convent*; & he refuses to returne: he hath been Canonically admonisht of his extravagances, & he slights it: he hath been *Excommunicated*, & he Laughs at it. In fine, in him *Hereticks* find a constant freind, *Schismaticks* a sure Advocate, *Apostates*, a certaine Patrone, & *Catholicks* an implacable Enemy; & yet he pretends he is nether *Heretick*, nor *Schismatick*, nor *Apostata*; but a *Catholick*, & member of the *Roman Church*,

Who can square these circles, & reconcile these *Contradictions*, betwixt his *Declarations* & *Actions*, that so a judgment may be framed of his *Tru Persuasion?* Whither shall we giue credit to, his declarations? Or his *Actions*? Those speake his being a *Catholick*, & he is nothing lesse. These declare his hatred to *Catholicks*, & their *Religion*, which yet he professeth. So we must conclude him a *Chimera*, one composed of contradictions, & his *Religion* is made vp of parts mutually destroying one another. Or else, that he hath no *Religion*: for as a *Chimera* cannot haue a being *In rerum naturâ*: so there can nether be an *Entity* composed of *Contradictions*, nor a *Religion*

ligion, for the ſame reaſon. At leaſt at the greate Audit, he can never fayle to heare *Diſcede a me*, &c. *Begon from me*: & whither ſo ever Religion he be of, his owne words will condemne him: *Ex ore tuo te judico, ſerve nequam.*

What can hence be gathered, but that his *Perſwaſion* being ſo vncertain, & his *Religion* ſo dubious, or certainly none at all, nothing can be thence gathered, as to the *Communion*, which he should enter into. If you think him well diſpoſed for your *Church*, you diſcover what kind of men it is compoſed of. Ours, that is the *Catholick Church*, doth not deſire ſuch, nor tolerate them, further than there is hopes of their amendment: & little, or none at all being left of this man, she hath caſt him out by *Excommunication*: As I learne from your owne letter. So by what I ſee, I conclude that, *You haue ſpoyled a Catholick, & not made a Proteſtant.*

Yet to moue him to come quite over, you very learnedly diſtinguish three ages of the *Church*. The firſt, whileſt she continued in that *Faith, which was once delivered to Saints.* p. 31. The ſecond [p. 32.] from the time, the *Pope tooke vpon him the title of* vniverſal Bishop. Yet you are not reſolved what time to allow to this *Second age, whither one thouſand, or eleven, or* twelue hundred yeares. The third, (p. 42.) from the two *Councils*, of *Lateran* vnder *LEO X.* & *Trent.* jmplying, that all were bound to communicate with the *Church of Rome* in its firſt age, myght communicate with it, in the ſecond; & muſt not in the third. Jn the firſt, Communion with it was a neceſſary duty: in the ſecond, it was lawfull, but not neceſſary: in the third vnlawfull, & a ſin. And theſe dreames take vp aboue 30. pages.

Rev. All this is a dreame: for the ſecond age, which you ſpeake of, is yet to come: the Pope never having taken the title of *Vniverſal Bishop.* Beſides this, *Chriſt* promiſt his aſſiſtance to the *Church* not for any determinate time; but for all times: & aſſured her of his preſence, till the end of the world: now when you shallproue, that *Chriſt* hath broken, or can, or will, breake his word, we will think

think your second age possible; not till then: so the first age, in which all are obliged to joine in Communion with the *Church of Rome*, is not expired, nor will, nor can ever expire.

D. M. p. 62. *Having quitted the Communion of the* Roman Church, *he is bound to joine with that of* England, *in* Conscience, it being the most perfectly *reformed Church in the world: & in* Prudence, *in order to the protection of his Person & provision for his future subsistance.*

Rev. You boast much of the perfection of your Reformation: yet were never able to get it approved by any one externe *Church*, of what denomination soever: & how many, or rather how few do vniversally approue it in *England*, appeares by the number of your *Sectaryes*, & *Schismaticks*. At what tribunal haue you not beene condemned, whereever you appeared? The *Pope* hath anathematized your Reformation: so hath the *General Council* of *Trent*, that *Church representatiue*. This Amphibium, this your Anonimous Preist, says you appealed to the *Church diffusiue*: which he gathers by the *Apologyes* you publisht for all men to see. But you haue had as ill successe here, as at *Trent*, or *Rome*: having never been able to find any one Kingdome, or Province, or Citty, or any considerable number of particular men, who in all things approue your *Reformation*. So that you are in this inferiour to the *Lutherans*, to *Calvinists*, to *Anabaptists*, to *Adamists*, nay to *Independents*, & *Quakers*, &c. Who all haue in several countryes some of their Perswasion; but of yours none out of *England*: & how many even there, owne their vocation to your *Reformation* more to the *Royal Authority*, than to the force of the *Truth*, you teach, or the Beauty of your *Church*, which you commend?

D. M. p. 63. *Prudence* obliges him to the same: for *He can hardly be safe any where beyond seas: & by joining with vs, he will: as also find provision for his subsistence*: *Which* you say *you will vndertake shall not be wanting.*

Rev. You sow the fox's skin to that of a Lyon, & *Spiritual motiues* falling short, you piece them out with *Temporal*. When we call to mind

to mind that within these fifty yeares your whole *Church* was turned out of God's Blessing into the warme sun, & that within these fiue yeares she was very neere the same fate, we may conclude, that there is not much greater assurance of your *Temporal*, than of your *Spiritual promises*. Here I obserue two things:

The first: that *Temporal motiues* are never omitted, when there is any hopes of gaining a *Proselit*. Indeed they are your best Card, as appeares by your vsing it so frequently: & by vsing it, you shew what weyght it hath with you.

The second: that in this you differ very much from *Papists*, who propose hopes of eternal life, indeed; but as for this, they promise nothing but what *Christ* promist his *Disciples*: 30. 16. 32. *In mundo pressuram habebitis*: *you shall be* hated, calumniated, persecuted, imprisoned, *Oppress*, hanged, *In this World*: But better all this, than to loose your soul, by *Schisme*, & *Heresy*.

D. M. p. 64. *It remaines therefore*, that being *obliged to quit the* Communion *of the* Church *of* Rome, *& joine with ours*, *of* England, *you are obliged to do this speedily*, &c.

Rev. All this falls to the ground: for there nether is, nor can be an obligation to quit the *Church* of *Rome*; there being an obligation to conforme to her, to submit to her devisions in matter of Divine Truths, & to renounce all errours, contrary to the tru Doctrine of Faith, which she teachs, & will teach to the end of the world.

Imprimatur.
Act. in Vic. die duodecima May 1683.

De Mand. Amplis. ac RR. adm. DD. meorum præfat.

B. D. SECRET.

R

DUARUM EPISTOLARUM GEORGII MORLÆI S. T. D. ET EPISCOPI WINTONIENSIS AD IANVM VLITIUM REVISIO.

In quâ, de Orationibus pro Defunctis, Sanctorum Invocatione, Dijs Gentilium, & Idololatriâ agitur.

AVTHORE IOANNE WARNERO S. I. THEOLOGO.

M. DC. LXXXIII.

Superiorum Permissu.

PRÆFATIO.

Væ istæ Epistolæ, quarum summam tibi hic exhibeo, Erudite Lector, vná cum responsionibus ad earum singula capita, pars sunt Libri ante quinque circiter menses, in Angliâ typis editi, á Dom. ac Mag. nostro Georgio Morlæo S. T. D. Oxoniensi, ac Episcopo Wintoniensi: qui Regem exulem olim secutus, inter Catholicos degens, aliqua zeli sui pro matre suâ Ecclesiâ Protestanticâ Anglicana specimina dedit, cum vivâ voce, tum calamo, varia Fidei Ortodoxæ capita impugnando. Quæ omnia libro isto continentur, additis alijs, quæ Patriæ postliminio restitutus & dixit, & scripsit. Adeoque complexus est hoc vno volumine (quod cento vocari potest, ex varijs tractatibus conflatus, nihil præter odium in Ecclesiam orthodoxam commune habentibus) hoc, inquam, complexus est, quidquid longissimo vitæ tempore (octogenario major est), adversus varia Ecclesiæ Romanæ dogmata improbo labore, & continuo studio colligere potuit.

Putabamus bonum Senem, contentionum istiusmodi pertęsum, cogitare cogitationes Pacis, charitatem potius quám schisma promovere malle, vnionem inter discordes Ecclesias, illi cordi esse, quam Prudentiores multi ex illâ sectâ aut seriò, aut simulatè optant. Et quidem ætas ingravescens, & planè capularis, vt receptui caneret, suadebat; turpe senex miles.

Cum ecce subitò, nemine de certamine ab illo futuro cogitante, in arenam descendit, seniles lacertos juveniliter jactat, de victorijs præteritis sibi gratulatur, easque ita prædicat, vt non senili Prudentiâ; sed juvenili levitate, sortis humanæ, & propriæ infirmitatis parùm memor, novas laureas, futurosque triumphos sibi polliceri videatur.

Quominus eum hac in re imiter, facit rerum humanarum incertitudo, & propria infirmitas, quas præ oculis semper habeo. Quo facilius judicium ferat Lector, Eximii Domini argumenta ipsiusmet verbis expressa meis responsionibus præmitto: non sum mihi conscius, me vspiam eorum vim dissimulasse. An planè ijs satisfecerim, iudicent alij. Novi hominum studia, & suos cuiquam affectus haud ita facilè avelli: nec incompertum, quantam isti vim habeant, ad judicium inflectendum, ne dicam corrumpendum. Hinc in causâ nostrâ non præjudico, neque veluti de partâ victoriâ in antecessum glorior: haud tamen exiguam spem in sinu foveo, ex bonitate causæ, ex assistentiâ Spiritus Sancti Ecclesiæ promissâ, & ex tuâ, Lector, veritatis amice, humanitate, responsiones nostras Eruditis, & æquis Iudicibus, à partium studio liberis probatum iri.

Docet nos Epistolarum Auctor eximius, eas ante viginti quatuor annos fuisse scriptas: quia posterior data est anno MDCLIX. & in lucem prodiit tantum hoc anno MDCLXXXIII. Vnde non ad novem annos tantum, vt consulit Poeta, sed ferè ad ter novem eas penes se retinuit. Ego verò ne quidem

totidem,

totidem dies ad responsa concinnanda impendi, licet variis interea temporis aliis implicarer occupationibus: illa siquidem auspicatus sum XI. Aprilis, & I. Maji absolvi. Quod non ita accipi velim quasi laudem aliquam ex festinato opere sperem (quod novi ancipitis esse ad laudem & vituperium æstimationis) sed vt ostendam nullam in iis Epistolis difficultatem occurrisse, quæ nos properantes diu remoraretur. Festinavimus autem, quo certius ad illum, fato jam vicinum, certè non valde remotum (quia *Senes non possunt diu vivere*, ait Latinæ linguæ Princeps) responsiones nostræ pervenirent. Licet enim dixerint græci, Senis errorem corrigere, & mortuum suscitare perinde difficile esse, de nullius tamen in melius mutatione desperandum est, donec vivit. Hinc spes est, fore, vt aut melius, aut certè minus malè de Ecclesiâ Catholicâ, & Apostolicâ sentiat, vbi scierit eam injustè de Idololatriâ accusatam esse: nihilque ab eâ fieri hoc sæculo, dum orat pro defunctis, & Sanctos invocat (quæ duo puncta ferè vnicè in his Epistolis tractantur) quod non fuerit factum primis, & etiam Hæreticorum judicio purissimis sæculis.

Aliud Idololatriæ caput à D. Morlæo intactum, ab aliis tamen eius Symmistis Ecclesiæ exprobratum, est Imaginum veneratio, quam ajunt cum Idolorum cultu convenire. Hos vt confutarem, Appendicem addidi, de Idololatriâ, sive cultu Idolis exhibito à Paganis: ex cuius explicatione patebit longè diversam esse venerationem Imaginibus exhibitam in

Ecclesiâ,

Ecclesiâ, à cultu, quo sua Pagani Idola prosecuti sunt: adeoque non minori iniquitate abominandum Idololatriæ crimen Ecclesię objici, quam non ita pridem Viris innocentissimis, Regique suo fidelissimis, obsequentissimisq; subditis, horrendum Majestatis crimen à Dei, Ecclesiæ, Regisque ipsius hostibus objectum fuit, Fide *verè Protestanticâ*, verè Calvinianâ: cum interea veram ipsimet in Regis, Regnique perniciem conspirationem adornarent, Regemque, eiusque Fratrem vnicum occidere meditarentur, & execrandi facinoris invidiam in Innocentes, nihilque eâ de re cogitantes Catholicos derivare, ab eis pænas sumere, eosdemque ob crimen ab aliis commissum, internecione delere. Quot in vno facinore facinora! Et hæc omnia, vt eliminatâ Monarchiâ, & extinctâ, aut exilio mulctatâ totâ Familiâ Regiâ, Genevensem in Angliâ Reipublicæ formam stabilirent; vt quique Prudentiores ab initio subodorati sunt, jam verò manifestè apparet.

Aliis Libri huius partibus Anglicè scriptis alia Fidei capita impugnat; quibus Anglicè respondi, vt juxta Grammaticæ Regulas cum Questione solutio conveniret, & Responsio quadraret objectioni. Qui linguam illam callent, de vtroque judicium ferent.

INDEX

INDEX SECTIONVM.

SEctio 1. *An Augustini sit Liber Meditationum ipsi inscriptus.* P. 1.

S. 2. *De Sanctorum invocatione.* P. 4.

S. 3. *Britannorum error in celebrando Paschate. Inde non constat eos ex Asiâ fidem accepisse.* P. 8.

S. 4. *De curribus militaribus & essedis Britannicis.* P. 11.

S. 5. *Differunt orationes pro defunctis à Sanctorum invocatione.* P 13.

S. 6. *Orationes pro defunctis ex patribus. Vbi de locis animarum à corpore separatarum.* P. 18.

S. 7. *Duplex Sanctos invocandi modus.*

S. 8. *Invocatio Sanctorum probatur ex scripturâ.* P. 32.

S. 9. *An, & quomodo Sancti norunt quæ hic aguntur.* P. 35.

S. 10. *Sanctorum invocatio ex Patribus.* P. 39.

S. 11. *Rationibus Theologicis probatur Sanctorum invocatio.* P. 46.

S. 12. *Differt Sanctorum invocatio à Dæmonum cultu apud Ethnicos.* P. 48.

S. 13. *Quid Gentiles de Deo, eiusque providentiâ & cultu senserint.* P. 52.

S. 14. *Varia spirituum genera apud Philosophos.* P. 61.

S. 15. *Spirituum mediantium in homines officia.* P. 64.

S. 16. *Deos Paganorum fuisse homines.* P. 73.

S. 17. *Gentiles Dæmonibus divinũ cultum exhibuerunt.* P. 84.

S. 18.

INDEX SECTIONVM.

S. 18. *Sanctorum invocatio differt à Dæmonum cultu.* P. 90.
S. 19. *Argumenta contra Sanctorum invocationem.* P. 98.
S. 20. *Argumenta contra Orationes pro defunctis.* P. 108.
S. 21. *Vindicantur Patres, & Peronius à calumnijs D. Morlæi.* P. 110.
S. 22. *Vindicatur Ecclesiæ praxis ab eiusdem calumnijs.* P. 114.
De Idololatriâ P. 119.
S. 23. *Qui primi Idololatræ.* P. 120.
S. 24. *Occasiones Idola faciendi.* P. 123.
S. 25. *Pagani sua Idola Deos vocarunt.* P. 126.
S. 26. *Pagani Deos coluerunt manufactos.* P. 131.
S. 27. *Idolis supplicarunt: in ijs spem habuerunt.* P. 135.
S. 28. *Bona omnia ab Idolis provenire crediderunt.* P. 137.
S. 29. *Causæ tanti erroris ex Apostolo.* P. 141.
S. 30. *Eiusdem criminis aliæ causæ.* P. 143.
S. 31. *Diaboli præsentia in Idolis. Et de eorum consecratione.* P. 146.
S. 32. *Vsus Imaginum, & Statuarum licitus in Ecclesiâ.* P. 150.
S. 33. *Earum cultus, & adoratio.* P. 153.
S. 34. *Cultus iste non est Idololatria.* P. 155.

REVI-

REVISIO
PRIORIS EPISTOLÆ
DOCTISS. D. GEORGII MORLÆI,
ad Janum Vlitium.

SECTIO I.

An Augustini sit Liber meditationum ipsi inscriptus.

D. Morlæus p 3. v. 4. *Erasmus ait se nec asseverare posse nec inficiari velle Augustinum libri hujus Auctorem esse. Bellarminus dubius etiam est, quia neque Possidius diligentissimus collector Operum Augustini in Indiculo ejus meminit nec citatur à Bedâ.*

Mihi vero ex hac Bellarmini observatione constare videtur, Augustinum non fuisse Auctorem hujus libri: qui alioqui non effugisset Possidium diligentissimum Operum Augustini collectorem.

Responsio. Si probabilitèr colligi dixisses, ex Possidii silentio librum non esse Augustini, ego sensui tuo non contentiosè refragatus fuissem. Sed dum ais *Constare*, tibi non assentientur, qui norunt argumenta negativa ab Auctoritate infirma esse. Hoc autem, quis non novit? & verò Possidium aliqua indubitata Augustini opera omisisse, notum est: talis est Liber *de Vrbis excidio*. Item Tractatus *de eo quod dictum est: Ego sum, qui sum*. Et Bellarminus in Observatione ad tom.6. Operum Augustini, disertè dicit, *Possidium singulos tractatus in Indicem non redegisse*: qui tamen Diligentiæ laudem meretur quod tam multa collegerit; licet aliqua illum effugerint: sic diligentes imo diligentissimi dici possunt messores, licet relictis aliquot spicis locum dederint spicilegio. Dei quidem semper perfecta sunt opera: in operibus hominum semper aliquid humani invenitur, aliquid incompleti,

 quod

quod æqui rerum æstimatores humanæ fragilitatis memores facile condonare, ubi non à voluntate malâ proficiscitur. Hinc merito dictus est Possidius *diligentissimus operum Augustini Collector*: licet ex ejus silentio solo *Constare* non possit opus aliquod Augustini non esse.

D. Morl. p. 5. *sunt quædam in isto Meditationum libro, quæ non possunt esse Augustini: nempe Hymnus cap. 26. numeris metricis, & Rithmicis compositus, quod genus Carminum Augustini sæculo ignotum fuit: utpote à Scholasticis post Augustinum multis annorum centenis excogitatum, ut ex Sixto Senensi Biblioth. l. 3. colligi potest. Iam verò si hoc rithmicum metri genus Scholasticorum inventum fuerit, quam absurdum sit hujusmodi Hymnum Augustino affingere (inter quem & Lombardum omnium Scholasticorum magistrum, sex ad minimum sæcula intercesserunt) nemo melius judicare potest quam tu, Vliti.*

Resp. Tuum ego vicissim judicium appello, mi Morlæe, an verosimile sit opus illud *Petri Lombardi* sæculo posterius esse? *Posterius* inquam nam si illud Rithmi genus à Scholasticis inventum fuerit, cum hi illius discipuli extiterint, necesse est opus ipsum illo Parisiensi Episcopo recentius esse, quod è Scholasticis aliquem habeat Auctorem. Hoc autem nec tu puto dicturus es; cum res tractatæ, tractandi modus, cogitationes, phrases, omnia reclament, à Scholasticis planè diversa. Adde, quod non facile dabis ullum opus, Scholasticorum sæculo compositum, in ullum è priscis Patribus nomen, & familiam irrepsisse. Et Ethnici & Christiani sua habuerunt sæcula μυθικα, sive fabulosa Sicut ergo inter Ethnicos datum fuit aliquod tempus, ultra quod nemo ex hominibus ad Majorum Gentium Deos transcriptus est, ita & inter Christianos datum ultra quod nemo illorum Patrum opera scripta sua transtulit. Quod de justis operibus intelligi volo, ne quis ob aliqua Instrumenta vel sacra vel prophana mihi litem moveat.

Error tuus futili tibicine sulcitur, scilicet: *Scholasticos Carmina Rithmica invenisse*: quod nec verum est, nec à Sixto Senensi tradi potuit. Sixtum Senensem ab aliquot annis non vidi. Ejus apud me magna est Auctoritas: quominus tamen ei assentiar hac in re, si sincerè illum hic citasti facit manifesta veritas, quam ostendi. Scholâ totâ quanta est, à Petro Lombardo, ortâ, antiquior fuit S. Bernardus, qui Epist.

CCCXII

cccxii, ad Guidonem, ait. *Hymnum composui metri negligens, ut sensui non deessem.* Fuerunt ergo Bernardi tempore, qui carmina sine metro, pangebant. Beda in Gentis nostræ historiâ multa habet rithmica carmina. Quid de versibus *Leoninis* dicam, quorum tam frequens in mediâ à Christo D. Ætate mentio, ut mirum sit tibi latere potuisse, imo & ante mediam ætatem. Vnde constat ex rithmis de Carminum sæculo judicium certum formari non posse. Neque dicas, quemque Leoninum versum duas habere partes, rithmo connexas; istos verò, de quibus agimus, tales esse, ut duo, vel etiam tres similitèr sonantibus syllabis claudantur: hujusmodi etiam Carmina antiqua sunt, ut patet ex cœnotaphio *Ethelberti*, primi Anglorum Regis Christiani.

Rex Ethelbertus hic clauditur in Poliandro,
Fana pians, certus, Christo meat absque meandro.

Accipe alterius Carminis simili Rithmo currentis exemplum:

Wenefreda Virgo fælix, gloriosa meritis:
Assistentes tuis festis, cæli junge gaudiis.

Item & ista de eâdem Beatâ Wenefredâ:

Virgo vernans velut rosa,
Agni sponsa speciosa
Martyr Christi preciosa
Wenefreda floruit.
Ex Britannis oriunda,
Fide firma spe jucunda,
Actu Sancta, mente munda
Mundi mendâ caruit.

Hæc, spero, non dices à Scholasticis profecta: etsi dixeris, facile erit ex antiquis tabulis contrarium evincere.

Quid ergo dicemus ad Sixtum Senensem, quem Laudas tui velut erroris Parentem: concedemusne illum in re facti falsum fuisse D. Reip: nihil aliud dicere potuisse videtur, cum veritate quam apud Scholasticos Rithmos ita fuisse in precio, ut metri nulla ratio habita sit, sive quod syllabarum quantitatem haud intelligerent, sive quod eam spernerent, aut etiam aversabantur. Cum ad eorum ætatem ali-

qua saltem metri fuerit existimatio. Cæterum illam penes me non habeo, nec ea est difficultas, ob quam operæ precium esset per aliorum bibliothecas eum quæsitum ire. Vides, doctissime Morlæ, primam impressionem tuam male successisse: Argumenta tua nihil probare: adeoque *Meditationum* librum germinum Augustini fætum esse posse, nisi aliud obstet.

Cæterùm quod tu frustra nobis extorquere conatus es, id tibi ultrò damus, librum non esse Augustini. Aliqua enim de se dicit illius Auctor, quæ in Augustinum non conveniunt: nempe c.XXXI ait: *Fidem suam ab ipsis incunabulis illuminatam fuisse semper per illustrationem Divinæ gratiæ.* Et c.XLI. ait se gravia peccata commisisse post Baptismum. Hæc ab Augustino dici de se ipso non potuerunt, qui in Manichæorum sordibus diu voluratus est, ante Baptismum (quem adultus suscepit) & post eum semper pientissimè vixit.

SECTIO II.

De Sanctorum Invocatione.

D. Morl. p. 5. *Istius libri Auctor multa ex Augustino consarcinavit, quibus multa de suo addidit, & inter alia illas Sanctos invocandi formulas: quæ eum nullum habeant in S. Scriptura fundamentum, nec in praxi veteris, & nondum corruptæ Ecclesiæ exemplum, illarum Meditationum consarcinator, ut superstitiosis sui tempore genio inserviret, Augustini nomine & auctoritate abutebatur* abusus est, debuit dicere.

Resp. Quo Auctore hæc dicis? nullo. Quo teste? Teipso. Quâ fiduciâ talia de illo asseris (quæ ad arcana cordis secreta spectare) quem nec de facie nosti, nec de nomine, neque dicere potes, quo loco, quove sæculo vixit? Ego verò censeo, Meditationum Auctorem virum fuisse pium (quod & liber ipse confirmat) qui in eo intimos animi sensus coram Deo effundit, ad id Augustini exemplo provocatus, cujus confessiones haud indiligenter legeret, ex quibus desumptas aliquas laci-

nias

nies operi suo attexuit. Quale illud c. XXXIII. *Laudat te homo magnâ portio creaturæ suæ.* Augustinus dixerat l. 1. confes. c. 1. *Laudare te vult homo, aliqua portio creaturæ tuæ.* Aliæ proferentur infra. Cæterum non credo Auctorem sibi nomen Augustini indidisse, aut personam induisse, alioqui melius scenam instruxisset, nec ea de se dixisset, quæ ignorare non poterat ab Augustino aliena esse. Vnde suspicor ab aliquo alio adfixum ei magni Doctoris nomen, idque bonâ fide: quòd videret librum istum in non paucis cum aliis ejusdem sancti Doctoris operibus indubitatis convenire. Nec mirum est, viros obæsæ naris id minime olfecisse, quod nec Bellarmino nec Erasmo patuit, quorum neuter opus Augustino abjudicat.

Falleris verò, quod pace tuâ dictum sit, dum ais *Sanctorum Invocationem nec in S. Scripturâ fundamentum, nec in veteris Ecclesiæ pravi exemplum habere?* Vtrumque enim falsissimum esse, dicemus, ad Epistolam tuam alteram, in quâ seriò nos aggrederis, qui in istâ tantum præludere videris & quasi velitari. In præsenti sat est, dicamus invocatos in S. Scripturâ sanctos vivos: Vnde sequitur invocandos esse & sanctos mortuos. Et priscam Ecclesiam sanctos Martyres invocasse, unde data ethnicis occasio Christianis exprobrandi, quod quem illi Diis suis cultum exhibebant, Christiani in Martyres transferrent. Adde quod nulla sit Liturgia antiqua, in quâ Sancti non invocentur. Hæc obiter.

D. Morl. p. 6. *Non inficias eo, quin in ipso Augustini sæculo hujus superstitionis semina & sparsa fuerint, & pullulare cæperint. Sed nego Augustinum in illo errore fuisse, aut tales invocandi sanctos formulas in Augustini temporis Ecclesiâ communiter receptas, aut publicè usurpatas fuisse.*

Resp. Quid semina sparsa pullulare incipientia dubitas, cum ampla seges totius Ecclesiæ agrum implens appareat? eam Prophetæ seminarunt Apostoli rigarunt, & Deus variis miraculis testatus sibi gratam esse, incrementum dedit. Paulus Diaconus, vir minimè superstitiosus, refert Theodorum Heraclii Imperatoris fratrem ingentem Barbarorum multitudinem Deo per intercessionem B. Virginis capitulante parva manu concidisse.

Hæc superstitiosa tibi videntur, & qui ea fovebant in errore versatos,

ſatos eſſe putas. Dic ergo quibus antiquis Auctoribus ita ſentias? quis primis illis ſæculis ſanctorum invocationem improbavit? Aliquos enim fuiſſe non nego: qui fuerint, quæro. Hæres, nec miror; tam infames ii ſunt, qui ſoli tibi, tuiſque Symmiſtis, hac in re patrocinantur, ut probro; non honori tibi futuri ſunt. Tales *Manichæus, Eunomius, Vigilantius.* Hi nobis adverſantur, quos Eccleſia illorum temporum rite devovit, anathemate percuſſit. Tales autem erant, à quibus nihil niſi magnum aliquod bonum condemnari potuerit. Vt in ſimili dixit *Tertullianus.*

D. Morlæus: p.6. *Cum Melancthone audacter dico, perverſum hunc, pravumque ſanctos invocandi morem (quantum vis poſtea cum Dei & ſanctorum contumeliâ in Eccleſiâ invaluerit) in tribus primis poſt Chriſtum ſæculis, non modo inuſitatum; ſed aut inauditum, aut damnatum fuiſſe: nec poſſe ullum certum & indubitatum teſtimonium ex ullis Patrum, qui ante quartum ſæculum vixerunt momentis in contrarium proferri. Vale.*

Reſp. Non modò quæritur, quid aut te, aut hic ſimiles Reformatæ Eccleſiæ Paranymphi, novæ ſectæ Vindices *audacter dicatis*; ſed quid probetis. Scilicet *perverſus pravuſque mos* eſt, quem *Hieronymus*, quem *Auguſtinus*, quem *Chryſoſtomus*, quem Eccleſia tota Catholica propugnavit. Vnici verò illis ſæculis Pietatis patroni ſunt *Manichæus, Vigilantius*, & eujuſdem furfuris alii! Cum Dei contumeliâ copulatur honor ſanctis exhibitus, qui teſtatur ſibi fieri, quæ illis fiunt, quos hæredes ſuos, Amicos, fratres, membra ſua, ſeipſum appellat, propter quem illos, quem in illis veneratur Eccleſia, qui variis miraculis honorem illis exhibitum, & illorum Invocationem ſibi gratam eſſe teſtatus eſt? Addis *cum Sanctorum contumeliâ eos à nobis honorari*? Quanta orationis ſtupiditas? & tamen in eâ ſtupiditate aſtutè inſidias incauto Lectori ſtruis, dum rejecto in nos, qui Poſſeſſores ſumus, probandi onere, Defenſoris ipſe partes adis; unde jure per tot ſæculorum poſſeſſionem acquiſito cederemus, & pares nobis eſſetis, qui tantum heri, ut ita dicam, nati eſtis: & vindiciæ ſecundum vos dandæ ſint, ſi nos in probatione deficiamus.

Dicis eundem *morem aut inauditum fuiſſe, aut damnatum.* Quæ quâ ratione

tione componi possint, non video. Si *damnatus* fuit, ergo non fuit *inauditus* &c. *inauditus*: ergo non *damnatus*. Sed auditus, id est cognitus, fuit ille mos, ut constat, quia *Manichai*, & *Vigilantius* illum improbarunt. Sed ostende per quem, quo loco, quove tempore damnatus fuerit, & manus damus. Non tamen velim nobis satisfactum putes, si quos modo nominavi damnatæ ipsos memoriæ homines morem istum improbantes produxeris. Nec iniquo animo ferre debes nos Ecclesiæ priscæ mole istorum nomen elidere, qui Calvini furores ejusdem Ecclesiæ auctoritati postponimus.

Nec desunt indubitatæ fidei monumenta, ex priscis sæculis pro sanctorum Invocatione. Talia sunt antiquæ Lyturgiæ, quas tempus edax rerum non consumpsit: illæ enim omnes, & singulæ sanctorum invocationem continent. Non dices opinor, Ecclesiam per tot sæcula lyturgiâ publicâ caruisse, ne vestræ, quam ab Enthusiastarum assultibus ægrè tuemini, securim infligas. Agnosco varia singulis lyturgiis antiquioribus addita fuisse: verùm illud, in quo omnes conveniunt, etiam antiquissimæ, ab initio fuisse videtur. Talia verò sunt, quæ de essentiâ sunt Sacrificii, oratio pro Defunctis, & Sanctorum Invocatio: quæ tria Lyturgiæ omnes exhibent.

Deinde Patres, qui IV & V sæculo floruerunt, & vestris non negantibus Sanctorum invocationes favent, de eâ loquuntur non ut de ritu novo; sed ut de pridem usurpato. Si paucius eâ de re locuti fuerint Antiquiores, id fieri potuit, quod Idololatræ ad Politheismum defendendum eâ abusi sunt, utpatet ex *Origine*, *Augustino*, *Hieronymo*, *Cyrillo*, aliisque quorum tamen nemo respondit Ethnicis ritum illum esse novum ab Ecclesiæ mente alienum, priscis ignotum, aut, quod tu dicis, à Christianis damnatum; sed illum admittunt, illumque defendunt, ab Idololatrarum errore distinguunt, & toto cælo differre demonstrant. Vnde liquet non eo tempore incœpisse; sed prius multò extitisse, fuisse Christianismo coævum ab Ecclesiâ receptum, à sanctis defensum, à bonis omnibus approbatum, à solis verò Hæreticis tum antiquis, tum modernis improbatum.

RE-

REVISIO

Posterioris epistolæ ad Ianum Vlitium.

PRÆFATIO.

DVobus tractatibus de oratione pro mortuis,& sanctorum Invocatione, duo parerga præmittit D.Morlæus, alterum de loco, unde primùm in Britanniam Euangelii lumen allatum est. Alterum, de Britannorũ Essedis,& currubus militaribus.Quæ nec prorsus omittere debui, quod obiter varia dicat cum veritate pugnantia:nec fusius prosequi,quia parerga sunt, à re, quam præcipuè intendit uterque aliena.Hæc dico, ut videat benevolus Lector, me non meâ sponte extra Controversiæ nobis propositæ metas excurrisse: Præeuntem enim Ducem secutus sum,etsi extra viam errantem, ut eum in veritatis viam reducerem, errorum suorum convictum, ut salutarem concipiat, humilitatem, vernaculo Hæreseos deposito typho.

SECTIO III.

Britannorum error in celebrando Paschate non probat eos ab Asiaticis fidem accepisse.

D. Morlæus p. 7. *Plusquam verosimile est Britannos rudimenta Christianæ Religionis ab Asiaticis primum accepisse: quoniam Augustinus à Gregorio I, ad prædicandum Euangelium Saxonibus missus veteres Insulæ incolas jam Christianos, & Orientalis consuetudinis in celebrando Paschate observantissimos invenit; nec ad contrariam Ecclesiæ Romanæ praxim ullis vel minis, vel pollicitationibus persuadere potuit. Et hoc mihi videtur esse Apodicticum argumentum nos primam in fide Christianâ instructionem non Romanis (ut illi jactitant,& inde jus, & Iurisdictionem Romanæ Ecclesiæ in nos vendicare) sed Apostolorum, aut Apostolicorum virorum alicui debere,* qui una cum Catholicâ *fide ritus in illis unde venerat locis usurpatos hic docuit.* Resp.

Resp. Noli, noli nimium de mutuò acceptis à Centuriatoribus argumentis gloriari: noli telis pridem exarmatis, & etiam fractis nimiùm confidere. Noli rationes futiles, in quâ præmissæ falsæ, & mala illatio *Demonstrationes* vocare, unde fiat, ut non melius de argumento tuo; sed longè pejus de te sentiamus, qui ipso in limine tam fædè impingis, ut non solum quales fuerint antiqui Britannorum mores, aut Quarta decimanorum errores ignorare; sed & quid sit Demonstratio, vel Ἀποδεῖξις nescire videare. Appulsus ad Anglos Fidei sacris imbuendos Augustinus, Britannos Christo nomen dedisse invenit. Vnde allatum Christi nomen, quæritur.

Româ dicimus nos cum totâ antiquitate, ex Oriente dicis tu, & Magdeburgenses. Vnde id probas? quòd *Orientalis consuetudinis in celebrando Paschate observantissimi erant.* Atqui hoc falsissimum est: nam Orientales, *Pascha* lunâ XIV celebrabant, inquamcumque hebdomadæ diem incidebat ut ipsum *Quartadecimanorum* nomen illis impositum indicat, & disertè tradit Eusebius L. V. Historiæ C. XXIII. At verò Britanni Scotique festum illud celebrabant semper, die Dominicâ, illâ scilicet quæ incidit inter lunam decimam tertiam, & vigesimam. Romani verò, hoc est Catholici, similiter jejunium die Dominicâ solvebant, eâ scilicet, quæ est inter Lunam decimam quartam, & vigesimam primam. Quos inter mores ea est differentia, ut Orientales quotannis judaizarent, Pascha eodem cum Judæis die celebrantes. Britanni & Scoti cum iidem perfidis Judæis convenirent, quoties Luna decima quarta incidebat in Dominicam.

Romani verò, sive Catholici, cum illis nunquam coincidebant. De quibus vide Baronii Epitomen ad an. Dom. CLIX & ad an. Dom. DCXXXIII. Alfordum, natalem Alexandrum, & alios.

Unde sequitur Britannos, Scotosque magis cum Romanâ Ecclesiâ, quam cum Orientalibus convenisse: siquidem Pascha in solâ die Dominicâ celebrabant, ut Romani ita Britanni; Orientales verò indiscriminatim, quâlibet hebdomadæ die. Deinde Orientales singulis annis; Britanni rarò cum Judæis conveniebant; & Romani nunquam.

Patet ergo non ab Oriente; sed Româ ductum Britannorum morem, qui solâ die solis Dominicam Resurrectionem soluto jejunio colebant, quod Romæ servabatur. Natus autem eorum Britannorum, error est ex solâ Cycli Paschalis ignorantiâ, quòd non scirent expectandam Dominicam sequentem, ubi concurrit luna decima quarta cum Dominicâ, in quo solo à Romanis differebant.

Hinc si quod ex Paschalis festivitatis observantiâ deduci possit argumentum ad ostendendum unde venerint primi Britannorum Apostoli, potius ostendet Româ, quam aliunde venisse.

Falsum etiam est, quod aliàs assumis, in solâ Gentis alicujus conversione fundari Jus Pontificis ad eam regendam. Jus enim illud, ea potestas, atque Jurisdictio à Christo Domino B. Petro una cum clavibus regni cælorum data est, quando Petrum creavit ovilis sui custodem, cujus Pastorem, suum in terris Vicarium. Vnde quâcumque ratione aliquis Fidei lumine illustratur, & in Ecclesiæ gremium admittitur, spirituali Christi Vicarii potestati subjicitur, & velut ovis Pastoris sui vocem audire, ei parere in spiritualibus tenetur.

Denique si fundet conversio jus, hoc Summo Pontifici eo etiam titulo computet in Angliam. Nec enim Anglis Euangelium per Britannos antea Christianos annuntiatum est: sed per Augustinum aliosque à B. Gregorio I, Româ missos: qui veri semper habiti fuerunt nostræ gentis Apostoli. Multa verò etiam magnaque fuerunt Ecclesiæ Romanæ in Britannicam ipsam officia, ex quo Angli advenæ Romanorum Missionariorum operâ suavi Christi jugo sua colla submiserunt, à qua suam habet Britannica Ecclesia Hierarchiam. Vnde tota Ecclesia Britannica quanta est, Romanæ filia est, & quidquid piæ indulgentique matri filia debet observantiæ, obedientiæ, dilectionis, id totum Romanæ Britannica debet.

Vides, opinor, doctissime Morlæe quot visus laboret Apoduricum istud, si Deo placet, argumentum. Firma stabilisque manebit sanctæ Sedis Apostolica in Britanniam auctoritas, quandiu non aliis arietibus concutietur.

SEC-

SECTIO IV.

De curribus militaribus, & Essedis Britannicis.

D. Morlæus p.VIII, & quatuor sequentibus, loquitur, de priscâ Britannorum ex Essedis pugnandi ratione, quam Cæsar l. IV. de Bello Gallico describit, atque miratur ob Aurigarum peritiam, & militum agilitatem, cum *in declivi, ac præcipiti loco incitatos equos sustinere & brevi moderari ac flectere, & per temonem percurrere, & in jugo insistere, & inde se in currus citissimè recipere consuevérint.* Solebant autem *primò per omnes partes perequitare, & tela conjicere, terrore equorum, & rosarum strepitu, ordines perturbare, inter equitum turmas se insinuare, tum ex Essedis desilire & pedibus præliari: ita mobilitatem equitum, peditum stabilitatem in prælis præstare.* Hæc de illis Cæsar loco laudato. Sed unde modum illum arcessas, non invenis videris autem in dubium vocare velle, an uspiam extra Britanniam curruum in prælis usus obtinuerit. Et primò historicos omnes (exceptis sacris) Olympiade primâ vetustiores à testimonio dicendo submoves auctoritati Varronis tempora illa μύθικα, sive Fabulosa vocantis. Homero & Virgilio fidem elevas, quod Poetæ fuerint, quibus (sicut & Pictoribus) *quidlibet audendi fuerit permissa semper potestas.* Hos currus finxisse, Homerum quidem quia grandius, & heroicis viris dignius ei videbatur, ex curru pugnare sedentes, velut in solio, quam si equo solitario veluti Gregorii milites insiderent. Virgilium autem illum imitari, dato suorum Heroatem cuique curru. Græcos nunquam curribus in bello usos colligis ex silentio Græcorum Historicorum. Idem de Britannis dicturum, nisi Cæsaris obstaret auctoritas.

In rem non Theologicam dilapsus est Sermo è quâ propterea paucis me expedio. Curruum multum olim fuisse in prælis usum non solùm Historici prophani, *Xenophon, Quintus Curtius, Plutarchus*, aliiq; sed etiam Sacræ litteræ testantur. Exodi XIV. *Tulit Pharao*, persecuturus Israelitas ex Ægypto discedentes *sexcentos currus electos, & quidquid curruum fuit, & Duces totius exercitus.* Judic. I, 19. Judas dicitur Montana sui juris fecisse, Vallium verò incolas debere non potuisse, quod

falcatis curribus abundarent. Et Judic. IV, 3, dicitur Jabin *nongentos falcatos currus* habuisse. Et 1.Reg.XIII, 5. *Philisthini Congregati ad prœliandum* 30000. *curruum, & 6000 equitum & reliquum vulgus sicut arena, quæ est in littore maris.* Ex quo patet.

Tres fuisse antiquitùs militum ordines; 1. Eorum, qui è curru pugnabant. 2. Equitum. 3. Peditum.

Colligitur ulterius, non Heroas tantum; sed etiam multos alios curribus impositos in hostes pugnasse: cum vix credi possit ex Regiis familiis, aut heroicis viris tot inveniri potuisse, qui 30000 curruum, aut etiam nongentorū implerent. Sicut ergo in nostrâ militiâ quique pugnacissimi, & manu promptissimi transcribuntur ad equos, ita tum ad currus. Nec somnium tuum probo, quod Poetæ Heroas suos dignitatis ergo curribus imposuerint, quòd grandius quid sit sedendo velut in solio pugnare. Nec enimverò in ipso pugnandi ardore sedisse arbitror, qui currus conscenderunt. Statio magis opportunus corporis situs est, sive in omnes partes intendenda cura, quod Imperatorum est, sive librandæ hastæ, jacienda pila, vibrandus gladius, quod militum. Ut ut ratio sedentium vigeat, languent tamen vires, remittuntur nervi; stantium excitantur, & ipsâ nervorum contentione totus homo incalescit, & permissâ Aurigæ equorum moderatione qui curru vehitur oculis, voce, utraque manu hostem ferit, & toto corpore pugnat.

Duo tamen reddebant currus aut minus utiles, aut planè inutiles. 1. Montibus aspera regio, per quam discurrere non poterant. Hinc Tribus *Iuda* Montana possedisse legitur: non tamen in Valles descendisse metu curruum falcatorum. Hinc etiam *Barac*, quo currus *Pabin* Regis Chanaan vitaret, in monte Thabor castra metatus est.

2. Arma militum vel offensiva, vel defensiva. In Macedonicam Phalangem nihil poterant quæ currus prælongis hastis arcebat. Nec in Legiones Romanos, adeo ferro muniebantur. Hinc Esseda Britannica, licet *novitate pugnæ*, ut Cæsar, ait, Romanum militem turbarint, hic tamen loricis, & amplis scutis tectus, ea facile submovit, quibus resistere vix potuissent hostes aut inermes, aut semiermes, quales ut plurimum olim Asiatici, & Cæsaris tempore Britanni.

Accedit

Accedit & alia ratio: quod in longinquis expeditionibus, quoties occurrebant montes asperi, magna erant impedimenta.

Hinc colligitur, quare rarior, nec diuturnus eorum usus in Italiâ, & Græciâ. Frequentes enim, & asperi montes in iis regionibus eos reddebant inutiles, sicut & gravis militum armatura. Hinc Galli eos seposuerunt. Sicut & Britannum ubi viderunt eos adversus Romanos Legionarios esse minus efficaces. Sed de his satis. Ad Theologicâ revertamur. De Purgatorio, & suffragiis pro Defunctis.

SECTIO V.

Distinguendam esse orationem pro Defunctis, ab Invocatione Sanctorum.

D. Morlæus p. 13. *Distinguere oportet illa duo: Invocationem intelligō Sanctorum, & Orationem pro Defunctis.* Nam non est idem, nec ejusdem considerationis *Defunctos orare, & orare pro Defunctis.*

Resp. Rectissimè ista duo distinguis, quæ non solùm Recentiores Theologi; sed etiam antiqui Patres, & antiquissimæ Liturgiæ distinguunt. Divina Missa S. Jacobi fratris Domini pro Defunctis orat. *Vt Patres, Fratresque nostri, qui jam obierunt, in pace requiescant, Dominum oremus.* Paulò post sanctos Orat. *Commemorationem agamus Sanctissimæ.... Dominæ nostræ matris Dei: ac omnium Sanctorum, & justorum, ut precibus, atque intercessionibus eorum omnes misericordiam consequamur.*

Liturgia B. Marci Orat. pro Defunctis: *Animabus Patrum, ac Fratrum nostrorum, qui antea in fide Christi dormierunt, dona requiem Domine Deus noster.* Orat. Sanctos: *Memor majorum nostrorum, qui à sæculo sunt Patrum, Patriarcharum, Prophetarum, Apostolorum Martyrum, Confessorum, Episcoporum, Iustorum, omnis spiritus in fide Christi Defunctorum, nec non eorum quorum hodierno die memoriam agimus, & S. P. N. Marci Apostoli, & Euangelistæ, qui demonstravit nobis viam salutis.*

Liturgiam S. Petri omitto, quia planè cum hodierna Romana convenit: hæc quippe aliquibus additis ex illa formata est.

Liturgia S. Basilii orat. Sanctos: *Inveniamus misericordiam, & Gratiam, in cætu omnium Sanctorum, qui à seculo tibi placuerunt. Præcipuè sanctæ Dei Genitricis, & semper Virginis Mariæ, sancti Ioannis Præcursoris & Baptistæ, Sancti N. cujus memoriam facimus, & omnium Sanctorum tuorum, quorum postulationibus visita nos Deus.* Pro Defunctis: *& memento omnium dormientium in spe resurrectionis, & vitæ æternæ, & refrigera eos, ubi visitat Lux vultus tui.*

Ejusdem Anaphora, pro Defunctis orat. *Offerimus Sacrificium hoc... pro tranquillâ requie eorum, qui ante hac occubuerunt, cum spem haberent in unigenito filio tuo, &c.* Sanctos invocat: *Dignare nos eorum etiam meminisse qui inde à sæculo placuerunt tibi, Patrum, Patriarcharum, cumque misericordiam tuam laudabilissimam, & amorem tuum erga genus humanum imitantes, assiduas preces, atque obsecrationes pro nobis tibi offerunt eoque memoriam illorum celebremus, ut quando nobis ipsis parum fidimus, memoriâ & legatione eorum protecti, per eos audeamus ad te accedere, atque tremendo hoc & sacro munere defungi.*

Liturgia B. Chrysostomi. Pro Defunctis orat. *& omnium, qui in spe Resurrectionis, & vitæ æternæ dormierunt, Orthodoxorum Patrum, & Fratrum nostrorum, benigne & clemens Domine dimitte*: & infra: *Memento omnium, qui dormierunt in spe Resurrectionis, & vitæ æternæ. Pro requie, & remissione animæ servi tui N. in loco luminoso, à quo aufugit dolor, & gemitus, fac eam quiescere Deus noster.* Sanctam Virginem, aliosque Sanctos invocat: *Sanctissimæ impollutæ supra omnem modum benedictum, gloriosæ nostræ Deiparæ, & semper Virginis Mariæ memoriam agentes, nos ipsos, & nos inter nos invicem, & omnem vitam nostram Christo Deo commendemus.* Hoc sæpè repetitur: tum additur. *S. Ioannis Prophetæ, præcursoris, & Baptistæ sanctorum Apostolorum, sancti N. cujus etiam memoriam peragimus, & omnium Sanctorum tuorum, quorum supplicationibus adjuva nos Deus.*

Missa, sive Canon universalis Æthiopum: ad Deiparam: *Lætare gloria nostrorum Parentum, quia peperisti nobis Emanuelem. O verè mediatrix ante Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum te supplices exoramus, ut memor sis nostri. Ora pro nobis, ut deleantur iniquitates nostræ.* Pro Defunctis: *Miserere Domine animarum servorum tuorum, & ancillarum tuarum, qui manducaverunt*

runt carnem tuam, & biberunt tuum sanguinem: & in fide tuâ quieverunt.

Liturgia Arabica: *Fac requiescere Domine in luce viventium, & habitatione lætantium parentes meos, ac majores, & fratres, tuos bonâ mente famulos.*

Missa S. Gregorii: cum memoriam fecisset *omnium Sanctorum, qui Deo placuerunt ab initio*: pro Defunctis orat. *Memento Patrum nostrorum ac Fratrum qui dormierunt in fide Orthodoxâ: concede ut omnes requiescant cum Sanctis tuis, & cum his quorum* (nempe Sanctorum) *nomina commemoravimus.*

Missa S. Cyrilli: Sanctos Commemorat: *Memento Domine Patrum nostrorum, Sanctorum .... qui ministraverunt in verbo veritatis, in rectitudine, da nobis partem & sortem cum iis ...* Deinde pro Defunctis: *Pro quibus intendimus orare, & pro aliis, qui dormierunt, & requieverunt in fide per Christum. Dignare Domine efficere, ut requiescant animæ eorum omnium, in sinu Patrum nostrorum sanctorum Abraham, Isaac, & Iacob. Effice ut habitent in loco viriditatis, super aquam refectionis, in Paradiso voluptatis, unde fugerit dolor cordis, & mæror, & suspirium.*

Missa Christianorum apud Indos. Orat. sanctos: *Commemoremus Beatissimam Dominam, Matrem Dei vivi ... Memoriam etiam veneremur Prophetarum .... Commemoremus quoque Patres nostros .... omnesque Doctores, & Presbyteros veritatis Doctores. Oremus ut ipsorum orationibus veritas pura, & sincera doctrina, quam illi docuerunt, & professi sunt, in omni Ecclesiâ sanctâ custodiatur, usque ad sæculi consummationem.* Pro Defunctis: *Recordemus etiam & Patrum & Fratrum nostrorum fidelium, qui ex hoc sæculo in Orthodoxâ fide transierunt. Oremus inquam, Dominum, ut illos absolvat, eorumque peccata & Prævaricationes dimittat, & efficiat eos dignos, ut cum justis & rectis, qui divinæ voluntati obtemperaverunt, lætentur in sæcula.*

Missale Romanum: Orat. Sanctos: *Communicantes & memoriam venerantes imprimis Gloriosæ semper Virginis, Genetricis Dei Mariæ ....* Beatorum etiam *Apostolorum, ac Martyrum tuorum, Petri &c. quorum meritis precibusque concedas, ut in omnibus protectionis tuæ muniamur auxilio.* Pro Defunctis: *Memento etiam Domine famulorum, famularumque tuarum, qui nos præcesserunt cum signo fidei, & dormiunt in somno pacis ... Ipsis Domine, & omnibus in Christo quiescentibus locum refrigerii, lucis, & pacis, ut indulgeas deprecamur, per Christum Dominum nostrum.*

Idem

Idem sensus ex variis Patribus ostendi potest, & verò datâ à te occasione ostendetur infra: licet vix opus sit eos producere, cum nihil aliud dicere possint Ecclesiæ Patres, quam quod ab Ecclesiâ didicerunt: Ecclesias verò diversas, loco sejunctas, tempore dissitas, & in rebus levioribus non satis concordes, solâ fide per Apostolos acceptâ, & charitate per Spiritum sanctum in eorum cordibus diffusâ copulatos audivimus una voce clamantes, & Deum enixè orantes, ut aliarum animarum (Deo nempe fruentium) preces exaudiat pro se: suas pro aliis, necdum refrigerio donatis, sibi per aliarum intercessionem bene sit; aliis per suam, quidni dicemus id ex Apostolicâ Traditione fluxisse, juxta regulam, quam Tertullianus adhibendam docet ad Traditiones Apostolicas ab aliis dignoscendas. Et sanè tantus ille apud Græcos, Latinos, Ægyptios, Æthiopes, Indos Arabes, non in re tantum, sed ferè in ipsis verbis, & loquendi modo consensus non potuit non ab uno cunctis communi fonte manasse. Quod si recte pronuntiat Augustinus epist. CXVIII. *Insolentissimæ insaniæ esse disputare, quin faciendum sit, quod tota per orbem facit Ecclesia*: Quid de vobis dicendum qui morem per totam Ecclesiam usurpatum impugnare, & condemnare audetis? Quod si vestra liturgia nihil aliud haberet mali, in se, hoc ipsum satis mali esset, evasisse tam antiquitus, tam generalitèr præceptam formulam, cujus nullum indicium in *Vestra cœnâ*, vel *Communione*, ut ineptè loqui amatis, apparet.

D. Morlæus p. 18 & 19. *Ritus Anglicanus cum antiquis liturgiis optimè convenire: quia in officio sepulturæ orat. ut Deus expleat numerum Electorum, & gloriam regni sui maturet. Gratias agit Deo, qua defunctum de præsentis vitæ ærumnis liberavit, monet etiam superstites de præsentis vitæ brevitate, & miseriis, & futuræ immortalitate, & felicitate.*

Resp. Nullo modo convenit cum illis, imo toto cælo differt: nec enim ulla funditur pro Defuncto Oratio. Et apparet de industriâ mutatam orandi formam ab Ecclesia usurpatam, ne fierent ullæ pro defunctis Preces. Quidquid enim hic à se refertur ad qualescumque eorum, qui funus prosequuti sunt & de amici, vel necessario morte afflicti sunt, solatium destinantur. Sed & illud notatu dignum, quod in

Com-

Communione vestrâ nullam de defunctis mentionem faciatis, quam antiqui ubique semper in ipsâ liturgiâ adhibuerunt.

Quam obrem imprudentèr, & in causam tuam perniciosè duas istas orationes distinguendas admonuisti, Doctissime Morlæe. Ipsa enim inter eas distinctio, ipsa diversitas, quæ datur inter eas (& aliquam dari necesse est fateare) causæ tuæ jugulum petit, eamque præfocat. Tertium enimvero statum Beatas animas inter, & damnatos evidentèr demonstrat. Nec enim pro damnatis preces aut obtulit unquam prisca Fidelium Pietas, aut offert hodierna, quia fidelibus omnibus semper certum fuit, est, & erit, *ex Inferno nullam esse Redemptionem* & contrarium Origenis in hoc Platonizantis dogma Ecclesia semper velut pessimam hæresim detestata est. Adeoque nullæ pro illic existentibus offerri possunt preces. Quare nec illas miseras animas oramus, nec pro illis. Alias igitur animas respiciunt Ecclesiæ preces, ex quarum diversitate nascitur certa persuasio, quod ipsæ sint in duplici statu, quarum aliæ ope nostrâ indigeant, nos aliarum; nos istæ sublevent, illas operâ nostrâ sublevemus. Veritas tibi hanc agnitionem invito extorsit. Verùm conscius tibi te causam tuam afflixisse, ei remedium paras, serum licet, & nihil profuturum, dum ais:

D. Morlæus p. 13. fine. *Oratione pro Defunctis non talem intelligo, qualis nunc est in usu apud Pontificios, nec tali innixam fundamento, ingenioso scilicet, & quæstuoso Purgatorii commento. Nam ex veterii Ecclesiæ consuetudine, orandi pro Defunctis, probari non potest, quamvis id falsò supponant, & gratis assumant Pontificii, veteres illos credidisse mortuos pro quibus orabant, in tali qualem illi somniant loco cruciatos esse, aut ex illo loco, aut cruciatu vivorum suffragiis liberari posse.*

Resp. Nihil supponimus, quod non antiqui posuerint, nihil assumimus, quod non illi largiti sunt. Nihil enim hac in re dicit Concilium ipsum Tridentinum, aut Pii IV, jussu edita fidei professio, quod non ferant illæ preces. Quid enim dicit ista fidei professio? *Purgatorium esse, animasque ibi detentas fidelium suffragiis juvari.* At illæ preces dicunt aliquas animas requietis indigere, eas-

que suffragiis suis sublevant. Hoc *ingeniosum, & quæstuosum commentum* appellas: quæ verba censuram continent inverecundam tuâ eruditione, & moderatione indignam: imo & falsissimam, & iniquissimam; cum nos nihil hic commenti fuerimus; sed traditam per manus doctrinam ab Apostolis ad nos usque derivatam amplectamur. Nec enim quidquam velut de fide tradit seculo decimo septimo Ecclesia, quod non crediderit decimo, quod non quinto, quod non primo.

Ex hoc laqueo elabi speras, recurrendo ad locum, qualem somniamus, ais: quibus tamen nihil somnii, imò nec somni obrepit. Sed ipse verè somnias, dum putas ea via effugere. Nobis hactenus non declaravit Ecclesia, animas aliquo determinato loco purgari: nec B. Gregorium damnavit, l. IV. Dialog. c. XL. Animam Paschasii Diaconi in Thermis purgari referentem. Temerè vero addis veteres non credidisse animas ullas illis suffragiis liberari: quod nulla ratione probabis. Imò falsò id dici patet, cum aliud sonent ipsæ preces solemnes, mentium, & sensuum locupletissimæ.

SECTIO IV.

Orationes pro Defunctis probantur ex SS. Patribus. Vbi de locis animarum separatarum à corpore.

D. Morlæus p. 14. *Primus veterum apud quem consuetudo Oblationum, & Orationum pro mortuis incurritur, est Tertullianus: sed is de tertio aliquo loco, sive receptaculo animarum à corpore separatarum nunquam cogitavit. Nam* l. IV. *contra Marcionem duo tantum loca excipiendis animabus corpore exutis constituit, ubi quasi sequestrentur in diem judicii Inferos pro reprobis, pro animabus vero justorum sinum Abrahæ.*

Resp. Non primus est Tertullianus, qui oblationum pro mortuis meminit. Constat enim ex libris Machabæorum pro mortuis etiam ante Christi in carne adventum oblata sacrificia: Quos, libros, licet negetis esse Canonicos, contra fidem Ecclesiæ, negare tamen non pote-

poteſtis veram continere hiſtoriam. Hoc in præſenti nobis ſufficit, quia probat Judæos conſueviſſe, ubi quis in aliquo peccato mortuus eſſet, pro illo ſacrificium offerre. Nulla facta eſt mentio de ſacrificiis pro mortuis in Lege Moſaicâ, quia rara (ſi tamen ulla) futuræ vitæ mentio expreſſa: ea enim ſub umbrâ temporalium promiſſionum latebat, ſuo tempore evolvenda. At verò inſtante legis Euangelicæ tempore, Deus per Prophetas, & Sapientes venturo ſoli præviam quandam præmittere voluit Auroram. Itàque reperta in exilio Babylonico, & poſt illud nomina Regni cæleſtis, Paradiſi, Gehennæ: dicti Deo vivere qui nobis eſſent piè mortui; & ſubinde præſcripta in lege pro viventibus ſacrificia expiatoria, pro illis uſurpata qui apud Deum viverent. Fuerunt fateor inter illos aliqui errores; quos Chriſtus ipſe reprehendit. Non tamen iſtum reprehendit: nec verò ab illo de errore quopiam ullo notatus fuit *vir ille fortiſſimus Iudas.* Hoc ſufficit ne nos illum de errore accuſemus: maximè cum quod ille fecit, eccleſia imitata ſit. Ad *Tertullianum* accedo.

Hunc tria loco poſt mortem agnoviſſe mihi certum eſt. Libro de Spectaculis c. XXXIV. *Cum non putes,* inquit, *animas & puniri, & foveri in inferis interim ſub expectatione utriuſque judicii, in quâdam uſurpatione, & candida ejus.* Et infrà: *Cum carcerem illum, quod Euangelium demonſtrat, inferos intelligimus, & noviſſimum quadrantem modicum quodque morâ Reſurrectionis illic luendum interpretamur, nemo dubitabit animam aliquid penſare penes inferos ſalvâ Reſurrectionis plenitudine.* Duo iſtic loca agnoſcit, præter illum poſt Reſurrectionem debitum. Clarius adhuc l. IV. contra Marcionem: *Aliud Inferi, ut puto, aliud Abrahæ ſinus. Nam & magnum ait intercedere regiones iſtas profundum, & tranſitum utrimque prohibere.... unde apparet ſapienti cuique.... eſſe localem determinationem, quæ ſinus dicta ſit Abrahæ.... eam autem regionem ſinum dico Abrahæ etſi non cæleſtem ſublimiorem tamen Inferis, interim refrigerium præbituram animabus juſtorum, donec conſummatio rerum Reſurrectionem omnium plenitudine mercedis expungat: tunc appariturâ cæleſti promiſſione.... Quod ſi æternus locus repromittitur, & aſcenſus in cælum ædificatur à creatore... cur non capiat ſinum Abrahæ dici temporale aliquod animarum fidelium receptaculum?*

Triplicem hic locum agnoscit : quorum primus Infernus, seu *Inferi*, nempe damnatorum : Alter *Abrahæ sinus*. Tertius *locus æternus in diem judicii repromissus*. Secundus ad tempus durabit, unde à Tertulliano dictus est *Temporale Tabernaculum*. Alii duo æterni sunt.

Neque dicas nonnisi post judicium patere locum tertium: jam enim ex Tertulliani mente Martyribus patet; qui lib. de Resurrectione carnis ait : *Nemo peregrinatus à corpore statim immoratur penes Dominum, nisi ex Martyrii prærogativâ, Paradiso scilicet non inferis diversurus*. Et l. de Anima c. XXXII. *Ioanni in spiritu Paradisi regio revelata, quæ subjicitur altari nullas alias animas apud se, præter Martyrum ostendit*... Et infra : *Tota Paradisi clavis, tuus sanguis est*. Martyribus ergo jam in Paradiso locum assignat, per quam vocem Beatorum sortem, quæ cælum jam dicitur, intelligit. Et plerique Patres eum imitati magnam faciunt differentiam Martyres inter, & alias, qui piè imò pientissimè moriuntur Unde minime mirum est aliquam in Beatitatis æternæ adeptione prærogativam ab illis Martyrio dari. Martyribus Ecclesiæ existimatio addidit eos fideles, quos Martyribus æquavit divina gratia ob vitam piissimam, & sincerum Martyrii votum. Justinus in dialogo cum Triphone, ait Hæreticos idem dicere de animabus omnium Fidelium.

Obiter aliquid addam de multiplici loco ex antiquorum opinione excipiendis animabus destinato, quo magis appareat quam falsi sint Moderni Hæretici duplicem tantum agnoscentes. Distinguebant plerique Christiani antiqui post Hebræos Paradisum inter, tertium cælum, aut cælum cælorum, sive Regnum. Ita Tertul. lib. de Præscript. Chrysostomus de Ligno scientiæ boni, & mali, & hom. XV, in Matth. Theodoretus, Cæsarius, Theophilactus, Ambrosius ad Michæam. *Vt per Paradisum ad regnum perveniatur; non per regnum ad Paradisum*. In Cyrilli Liturgia primò petitur *quies in Paradiso voluptatis*. Deinde ut resuscitatis corporibus *digni sint regno cælorum*. Attendenda Methodii verba apud Epiphanium : *Apostolus Paradisum in tertio cælo non collocat* inquit, *si quis novit ad subtilia ejus verba animum attendere : scio hominem hujusmodi raptum usque ad tertium cælum, & scio hujusmodi hominem, sive in corpore suo, sive extra corpus nescio, Deus scit, quoniam raptus est in Paradisum. Vbi duas magnas sibi*

reve-

revelationes obtigisse dicit, bisque in sublime se raptum, semel ad cælum tertium, semel in paradisum. Denique Augustinus epist. LVII, *Paradisus non in cælo existimandus est: neque enim eo ipso die in cælo futurus erat homo Christus Iesus; sed in inferno secundum animam, in sepulchro secundum carnem.*

Ex quibus colligi videtur secundum antiquos Paradisum locum fuisse Gaudii: tertium vero cælum gloriæ. Cui expositioni conformis est visio cuidam facta apud Bedam lib. v. hist. c. XIII. de quâ etiam Bellarminus lib. II. de Purgatorio c. VII. Rem ego in medio relinquo. Redeo ad orationes pro defunctis.

D. Mors. p. 14. *Ex usu priscæ Ecclesiæ per oblationem pro defunctis non intelligebantur oblationes propitiatoriæ, seu expiatoriæ: sed eleemosynariæ. Nam propitiatoriæ à solis Sacerdotibus offerebantur: aliæ verò offerebantur à viro pro conjuge à viduâ pro marito: quod habet apud Tertul. lib. de Monagamiâ, & lib. de Exhortatione castitatis. Concilium* etiam Carthaginense IV. c. LXXXV. *Excommunicat eos, qui oblationes defunctorum aut negant Ecclesiis, aut difficulter reddunt.*

Resp. ex ignorantiâ nata est ista objectio, quod credas unius tantum rationis dari in Ecclesiâ suffragia pro defunctis: cum si vel hodiernam Ecclesiæ praxim, vel antiquas tabulas consuluisses, diversa esse comperisses. Eleemosynæ dantur etiam hodie; de quibus agunt illa quæ profers testimonia, etiam ex concilio Carthag. IV. quod sub pœnâ excommunicationis retineri vetat Eleemosynas vel ex testamento, vel justo titulo Ecclesiæ debitas. Præter quæ Laicorum dona fuisse alia *suffragia propitiatoria, & expiatoria* à solis sacerdotibus oblata probant tum ex variis Liturgiis petita testimonia, tum clarissimè Augustinus Enchiridii c. CX. *Neque negandum est*, inquit, *Defunctorum animas pietate suorum viventium relevari, cum pro illis sacrificium mediatoris offertur, vel Eleemosynæ in Ecclesiâ fiunt: sed iis hæc prosunt, qui cum viverent, ut hæc sibi prodesse possent, meruerunt. Est enim quidam vivendi modus, nec tam bonus ut non requirat ista post mortem, nec tam malus, ut ei non prosint ista post mortem. Est verò talis in bono, ut ista non requirat: & est rursus talis in malo, ut nec his valeat, cum ex hac vitâ transierit adjuvari.* Ubi triplicem animarum à corpore solutarum statum clarè distinguit: il-

læ quæ suffragiis non indigent sunt Beatæ : quæ suffragiis juvari non possunt sunt damnatæ : quæ illis juvantur , iisque indigent , sunt in Purgatorio. Distinguit etiam sacrificia quæ fiunt à sacerdotibus, ab Eleemosynis, quæ offeruntur à laicis. Deinde Augustus lib. XXI. de Civit. Dei c. XXIV. ait : *Ecclesia orat pro Defunctis , qui licet in Christo renati, non adeo malè vixerunt in corpore , ut tali misericordiâ habeantur indigni : nec iidem sic benè , ut inveniantur tali misericordiâ non indigere.* Et idem repetit lib. de curâ pro mortuis.

Vides nihil tibi prodesse distinctiunculas tuas ex malè intellectis testimoniorum quorumdam verbulis extractas. Non negabis, opinor, antiquorum judicium visum sacrificium mediatoris non tantum ἐυχαριστικὸν; sed etiam ἱλαστικὸν. Dicat ergo centies Tertullianus maritum pro conjuge, hanc pro illo offerre debere : hoc tamen optimè convenit cum Ecclesiæ sensu , & olim , & etiamnum sacrosanctum Missæ sacrificium pro illis offerentis. Adeoque effugium tuum præcludit illud unum Augustini testimonium ex Enchiridio. Cui similia verba habet Chrysostomus hom. XLI. in 1. ad Cor. infra citandus : qui etiam *sacrificia* ab *eleemosynis* pro mortuis offerendis accurate distinguit. Idem facit Isidorus Hispal. l. 1. de Offic. c. XVIII. Adde alia.

Tertullianus ipse l. de coronâ militis c. III. inter varias Christianorum consuetudines , & hanc recenser: *Oblationes pro defunctis pro natalitiis annuâ die facimus.* Et c. IV. *Harum & aliarum disciplinarum, si legem expostules Scripturarum , nullam invenies : Traditio tibi prætendetur auctrix, consuetudo confirmatrix , & fides observatrix.*

Dionysius l. de Eccles. Hierarch. c. VII. *Accedens venerandus Antistes precem sacram super mortuum peragit, precatur divinam clementiam, ut cuncta dimittat per infirmitatem humanam admissa peccata defuncto , eumque in luce statuat , & regione vivorum.* Negas quidem Areopagitæ esse illa scripta: negare tamen non potes esse pii , & antiqui scriptoris, qui priscæ Ecclesiæ sacros ritus & optimé calluerit , & accuratè retulerit : quod mihi sat est , ne ad alienam ab instituto materiam identidem digrediendum sit.

Cyp. Epist. LXVI. *Episcopi salubriter providentes censuerunt ne quis frater excedens*

excedens ad tutelam, vel curam Clericum nominaret: ac si quis hoc fecisset, non offerretur pro eo, nec sacrificium pro ejus dormitione celebraretur. Nec enim meretur apud Altare Dei nominari in sacerdotum prece, qui ab altari Sacerdotes, & ministros voluit avocare. Et subinde vetat pro Victore defuncto Sacrificium offerri, quod is Geminium Faustinum presbyterum Tutorem nominasset.

Arnobius l. IV. adversus Gentes: *In conventiculis nostris summus oratur Deus: Pax cunctis, & Venia postulatur, magistratibus, exercitibus, Regibus Familiaribus, inimicis, adhuc vitam degentibus, & resolutis corporum vinctione.*

Cyrillus Hierosol. Car. Mystag. v. *Pro defunctis SS. Patribus, & Episcopis, denique pro omnibus oramus, qui inter nos vitâ functi sunt, maximum esse credentes animarum juvamen, pro quibus offertur precatio sancti illius, atque tremendi, quod in altari positum est sacrificii. Quod exemplo vobis demonstrare volumus scio enim multos dicere, quid juvat animam sive cum peccatis sive absque peccatis ex hoc mundo decedentem, etiamsi in hoc sacrificio illius mentio fiat? An enim si Rex aliquis eos, à quibus offensus est, in exilium pepulerit, postea vero illorum propinqui coronam aliquam conficientes, pro his, qui sunt in supplicio exulibus eidem offerant, nonne condonationem supplicii ipsis dederit? Ad eundem modum & nos pro Defunctis precationes adhibentes, quamvis sint peccatores, non quidem coronas plectimus; sed Christum pro peccatis nostris mactatum offerrimus, ut & nobis & illis, eum qui est benignissimus propitium reddamus.*

D. Morlæus p. 45. *Cyrilli catecheses mystagogicæ sunt Apocryphæ, quia Velserus ait illos in Bibliothecâ Ausburgensi cum hac inscriptione esse Mystagogicæ Catecheses quinque Ioannis Episcopi Hierosolymitani.*

Resp. Quid si demus in illo MS. ita haberi? sexcenta alia MM. SS. per totum orbem sparsa Cyrillo catecheses illas adscribunt. Hieronymus l. de script. Ecclesiasticis Cyrillum Catecheses scripsisse refert, quod quare non etiam de hoc opere intelligi debeat, tu dices, ubi fuerit otium. Eidem tribuunt hoc opus omnes illius editiones. Num unius obscurrissimi M. S. Inscriptio fidem toti orbi litterario detrahet? Iniquissimé id petis. Sed si demus tibi, quod inique petis.

illi

illi uni M.S. fidem habendam; aliis omnibus & MSS. & editionibus negandam. Quid tum postea? Est inquies, *Ioannis Hierosolymitani.* Sit ita, quandoquidem id velis. Vixit is Hieronymi tempore, ut ex contentionibus inter eos acribus constat: licet iste varia in isto Ioanne reprehendat, nihil tamen quod à Catechesibus istis sumatur. Unde sequitur, si Ioannis sit illud opus, hoc quarto sæculo fuisse scriptum. Deinde illud esse omni exceptione majus. Hinc inconcussa manet harum Catecheseon auctoritas.

Epiphanius hæresi LXXV. (quæ est Aëtianorum) istis contrarium errorem adscribit. (quod etiam facit Augustinus l. de Hæres. hæresi LIII.) & in expositione Catholicæ fidei, num. XXIII. ait: *Iam vero quod ad mortuos spectat, nominatim de illis fit mentio, & preces ac Sacrificia, mysteriaque frequentantur.*

Chrysost. hom. XLI. in I. ad Cor. *si peccator excessit, propterea etiam lætari oportet, quod intercissa sint peccata, & vitio non adjecit, & quoad fieri potest ei succurrere non lachrimis; sed precibus & supplicationibus, & eleemosynis, & oblationibus. Non sunt enim ista frusta excogitata, neque frustra eorum qui excesserunt meminimus in divinis mysteriis, & pro ipsis accedimus rogantes agnum propositum qui mundi peccatum tulit; sed ut iis inde aliqua sit consolatio. Neque inaniter is qui adstat altari, quo tempore veneranda mysteria peraguntur, clamat pro omnibus in Christo mortuis, & pro iis qui eorum memoriam celebrant. Nisi enim commemorationes ipsis essent utiles, non talia dicerentur. Non enim ludus sunt res nostræ. Absit ex Spiritus ordinatione ista fiunt.* Deinde l. VI. de Sacerd. ait Sacerdotem precari, ut Deus propitius sit peccatis non modo viventium; sed & eorum, qui decesserunt. Alibi asserit id ab Apostolis institutum. hom. III. in Epist. ad Philip. *Non frustra hæc ab Apostolis sunt legibus constituta, ut in venerandis, atque honorificis mysteriis memoria fiat eorum, qui decesserunt. Noverant hinc multum ad illos lucri accedere, multum utilitatis.* Et hom. XXI. in Acta: *non frustra oblationes pro Defunctis fuere, non frustra preces, non frustra eleemosyna. Hæc omnia SPIRITVS disposuit, volens, ut nos mutuo juvemus.* &c.

Theodoretus lib. V. hist. c. XXXVI. refert Theodosium juniorem coram B. Chrysostomi sepulchro Parentibus Arcadio & Eudoxiæ defunctis veniam petiisse.

Ambrosius

Ambrosius in orat. funeb. de obitu Satyri fratris: *Tibi nunc omnipotens Deus innoxiam commendo animam*, inquit, *tibi hostiam meam offero. Cape propitius, ac serenus fraternum munus, sacrificium Sacerdotale.* Et orat. de obitu Valentiniani: *Piam animam nostris orationibus prosequamur.* Et epist. LXI. ad Faustinum: *Itaque non tam deplorandam, quam prosequendam Orationibus reor: nec mæstificandam lachrimis tuis; sed magis oblationibus animam Deo commendandam arbitror.*

Ex Augustino aliqua protuli superius. Addo quæ sequuntur, ex lib. de curâ pro mort. c. I. *Adjungis etiam vacare non posse, quod universa pro defunctis Ecclesia orare consuevit.* Hæc refert ex S. Paulino, Episcopo Nolano, ut constat ex lib. ad VIII. Dulcitii quæst. q. II. De suo addit. *In Machabæorum libris legimus oblatum pro mortuis sacrificium. Sed etsi nusquam inscripturis veteribus legeretur, non parva tamen est universæ Ecclesiæ, quæ in hac consuetudine claret, auctoritas: ubi in precibus Sacerdotis, quæ Domino Deo ad ejus Altare funduntur, locum suum habet etiam commendatio mortuorum.* Et c. IV. ejusdem operis: *Non sunt prætermittenda supplicationes pro spiritibus mortuorum: quas faciendas pro omnibus in Christianâ & Catholicâ Societate defunctis, etiam tacitis nominibus quorumque sub generali commemoratione suscepit Ecclesia.*

Hinc confirmantur, quæ ex Liturgiis produxi superius, & inde intuli, nullam prorsus esse, aut fuisse, quæ non decernat pro defunctis orandum. Quod suo testimonio confirmant duo magna illius eruditissimi sæculi lumina, Augustinus, & Paulinus.

Ex posterioribus Patribus unum tantum adducam, is est Isidorus Hispalensis l. I. de officiis Eccles. c. XVIII. *Sacrificium pro defunctorum fidelium requie offerri, vel pro iis orari, quia per totum orbem custoditur, credimus quod ab Apostolis traditum sit. Hoc enim ubique Catholica tenet Ecclesia, quæ nisi crederet Fidelibus defunctis dimitti peccata, non pro eorum spiritibus, vel eleemosynam faceret, vel Deo sacrificium offerret.*

Ex quibus omnibus Constat I. Sacrificium pro defunctis antiquitùs oblatum fuisse.

Constat II. Sacrificium illud non fuisse solam eleemosynam, ut D. Morlæus dixit.

Constat III. id factum per totam Ecclesiam.

Constat IV. Sanctis illis persuasum fuisse, quòd preces illæ ab Apostolicâ Traditione manarint.

Addo Nysseni verba Orat. De mortuis, licet non tam orationem pro mortuis, quam Purgatorium adstruant directè. *Qui vel in præsenti vitâ Sapientiæ studio, & precibus purgati, vel post obitum per expurgantis ignis fornacem expiati, ad sempiternam felicitatem perveniunt.* Ad Morlæum revertor.

D. Morlæus p. 15. *Non nego in officio mortuorum precationes etiam factas pro iis, quibus aliquid optari videtur. Nam Tertullianus illis optat refrigerium, licet in eo aut jam essent, quia in sinu erant Abrahæ, aut nunquam futuri essent, quales qui in Inferno. Tertullianus autem tertium locum non agnoscit. Restat ergo dicamus veteres illos sensisse posse aliquid à Deo peti, quod jam concessum à Deo crederent.*

Resp. hic expressam habemus viri cum manifestâ veritate luctantis imaginem. Supra negasti preces pro Defunctis. Jam preces admittis, sed tales, quæ nihil petant, quam quod jam habetur, hoc est quæ non sint preces. Nec dicis, neque dicere potes, quem in finem fundantur istæ preces? Tertullianum triplicem locum agnovisse jam ostendimus: *Infernum* nimirum, *Abrahæ sinum*, & *locum æternum* a Martyribus insessum, aliis Sanctis præparatum.

D. Morlæus p. 16. *Augustinum pro matre suâ Monicâ oravit quam salvam esse credidit: petiit, ut dimittantur ei debita, quæ dimissa credebat.* Quia ait: *Credo quod jam feceris, quod te rogo; sed voluntaria oris mei approba.*

Resp. Ecclesia nunquam oravit aut pro iis, quos certò credidit in cælo esse, quales 1. Martyres. 2. recens à Baptismo mortui: aut pro iis quos certò scit ex cælo in æternum exclusos, quales non baptizati, & qui sunt in statu peccati mortalis defuncti. Pro iis verò de quibus nihil certò constat, orat. quantacumque sit pro alterutrâ parte probabilitas, ob incertitudinem divinorum judiciorum, & obscuritatem in quâ versamur. Multi enim videntur Sancti, qui meri sunt Hypocritæ: aliarum pia vita in Christo abscondita est. Itaque *non ante tempus judicamus*, quod admonet Apostolus; *donec adveniat Dominus, abscondita*

scondità tenebrarum illuminans, & cordium consilia revelans. Ad illud usque tempus pro aliis timemus, de aliis benè speramus: de neutris judicium ferimus, ob erroris periculum. Talis erat Augustini de Matris suæ statu spes metu mixta, quod indicant hæc ejus verba: *Quamquam illa in Christo vivificata sic vixerit, ut laudetur nomen tuum in fide, moribusque ejus; non tamen audeo dicere, ex quo eam per Baptismum regenerasti, nullum verbum exiisse de ore ejus contra præceptum tuum: & dictum est à veritate filio tuo: qui dixerit fratri suo, Fatue, reus erit gehennæ ignis.* Hæc Augustinus l. IX. Conf. c. XIII. Quare benè sperabat Augustinus de illius statu, timebat tamen ne quid illicitum humana fragilitate perpetrasset, pro quo non plene satisfecisset in vitâ. Hinc ut si quid esset ejusmodi Deus id misericorditer condonaret, & ipse oravit, & ut alii orarent enixè petiit. Et hic est fidelium sensus in hunc usque diem: quantacumque enim sint pro felici statu cujuspiam argumenta, sacrificia, aliaque suffragia pro eo fiunt, donec per aliquam Ecclesiæ declarationem (quam Canonizationem vocamus) constet eum beatitudine jam donatum esse: tunc enim cessant pro illo preces, & in illius invocationem convertuntur.

D. Morlæus p. 17. *Commemoratio defunctorum potissimùm fiebat, ut inde pateret. Tam vivos, quam mortuos ad idem Ecclesiæ corpus pertinere, & neminem unquam tam Sanctum fuisse, qui non hujus beneficio sacrificii indigeret.*

Resp. neque nihil dicis, neque totum. Vt ut enim non negem illos quoque fines intendi; at quominus illa tantùm intendi dicamus, faciunt expressa cum Liturgiarum, tum Patrum verba aliud significantia, & ipsa precum varietas, quæ pro defunctis, & ad Beatos diriguntur. Opem animabus purgantibus ipsi ferimus; Beatos, ut nobis opem ferant, oramus. Sicque officiis certando, nos aliis, alios nobis prodesse docemus. Et hæc est *Sanctorum communio*, quam Catholici profitemur, ut *pro invicem solicita sint membra, & ubi unum patitur, alia condolent. Vbi unum gloriâ afficitur, alia congaudent.* In hac verò vitâ datur alterius meritorum communicatio. Non est talis communio Protestantica: quæ sterilis est in hac vitâ, cum merita nulla agnoscat: & inutilis in aliâ, ad id solum instituta, ut videamur unius corporis mystici partes esse.

D.Morl. p. 18. *Pontificii orant pro iis, quos credunt esse in cruciatu. Veteres pro iis orabant, quos credebant esse in refrigerio.*

Resp. neque veteres orarunt, neque nos oramus pro iis, quos certò constat visione Dei frui: alioquin orassent antiqui pro Martyribus; quod cum horum injuriâ conjunctum esse asseverat Augustinus. Idem de aliis Beatis eandem ob causam.

D.Morl. p.19. *Augustinus de tertio inter Beatorum, & damnatorum sedes loco, timidè, hæsitabundè, & problematicè disputat. In uno loco, dicit Animus Defunctorum pietate viventium liberari ex Purgatorio. Alibi, sit ne Purgatorium non audet statuere. Nam* lib. XXI. *de Civ. Dei* c. XXVI. *ait*: Forsitan verum est. *Et in Enchir.* c.LXIX. Tale aliquid post hanc vitam esse, non est incredibile, & utrum ita sit quæri potest. *Ad Dulcitium denique: eadem repetit, & addit*: Hæc descripsimus, ut tamen in iis nulla velut canonica constituatur auctoritas.... *Hoc certum, est, quod Augustinus nihil de Purgatorio definivit, multò minus pro dogmate fidei habuit, aut ab aliis haberi voluit.*

Resp. Augustinus neque *timidè*, neque *problematicè* de Purgatorio locutus est; sed assertivè, & dogmaticè. Hoc patet ex iis, quæ ex illo protuli. Nec in toto Augustino quidquam invenitur, quod probet ipsum de Purgatorio ipso unquam dubitasse. Quæ verò citas de Purgatorio ipso non loquuntur. Augustinus enim Enchiridii c.LXVIII, loquitur de dolore, quem sentiunt homines ob amissionem rerum temporalium quas inordinatè quidem in hac Vitâ diligunt: non ita tamen ut Christum deserere velint, ne eas amittant. *Hunc urit*, inquit, *rerum dolor, quas dilexerat amissarum; sed non subvertit, neque consumit fundamenti stabilitate munitum.* Deinde c.LXIX. ait: *Tale aliquid post hanc vitam fieri incredibile non est, & utrum ita sit, quæri potest, & aut inveniri, aut latere, nonnullos fideles per ignem Purgatorium quantò magis minusve dilexerunt bona perituria tantò tardius, citiusve salvari.* Et lib. de fide & Operibus c. XVII. *Sive in hac vitâ tantum homines ista patiuntur, sive etiam post hanc vitam talia quædam judicia subsequuntur, non abhorret à veritate quantum arbitror, iste intellectus hujus sententiæ.* Quæ ferè totidem verbis, certè non multùm mutatis iterum refert l. de octo Dulcitii quæstion. q. I. Hæc Augustinus.

Ex

Ex quibus patet, locis citatis non esse sermonem de ipso Purgatorio; sed de tristitiâ quam animæ vel corpori vinctæ, vel eodem solutæ sentiunt ex rerum, quas inordinatè diligunt amissione. Hanc aliquas animas in corpore sentire, notum est quotidianâ experientiâ. An extra corpus eandem sentiant, dubitat Augustinus, dubitamus & nos: nec ullâ vel Ecclesiæ definitione, vel Scripturæ sacræ auctoritate, vel Patrum testimonio, vel efficaci ratione, alterutra pars ita stabilitur, ut non vacillet assensus ei præstitus. Si ex hac nostrâ declaratione inferre velis, nos de ipso Purgatorio dubitare (qui similem ob causam id de Augustino dixisti) more hymnistarum tuarum argumentaberis, hoc est ineptè. Atqui talis est illatio tua de sensu dubio Augustini circa Purgatorium.

Augustinus igitur absolutè affirmat esse Purgatorium: hoc asserunt alii Patres, hoc clamant Liturgiæ, hoc tradit Fides, hoc fidelium praxis demonstrat; hoc tota Ecclesia Catholica docet. Soli vero *Aëtius*, *Vigilantius*, *Calvinus*, & ejus generis hominum ob hæreses damnatorum quisquiliæ negant. Vide, mi Morlæe, num difficilis sit optio, quibuscum in aliâ vitâ accenseri malis, cum Catholicis, an cum Hæreticis, cum Sanctis, an cum Damnatis: & exinde statue quorum nam sententiæ sis in præsenti adhæsurus.

DE SANCTORVM INVOCATIONE.

SECTIO VII.

Duplex Sanctos invocandi modus.

D Morlæus p. 20. *Quicquid de Oratione pro mortuis senserit Augustinus vel Ambrosius, non tamen inde sequetur aut ipsum, aut ullum alium ex reliquis, Invocationi Sanctorum patrocinatum esse. Nam invocatio Sanctorum cum oratione pro mortuis nihil habet commune. Et præterea hæc est aliquo modo licita; illa toto genere illicita: hæc inutilis, & superstitiosa; illa idolatrica, & in Deum, & Christum contumeliosa.*

Resp. Si solis censuris pugnandum esset, & vicisse credendi forent, qui acerbiores proferrent, etsi omni ratione destitutas, rixosis mulierculis, petulantibus Adolescentibus, atque morosis senibus, tutius committeretur disputatio Theologica, quam viris in eâ Artium, scientiarumque Reginâ peritis: Xantippe socrati præstaret, Zoilus Homero, Semei Davidi, & pueri Bethelitæ, Elizæo. Sed absit tam abjectè de hominum genere, de Christianis sentiamus, ut censeamus eos adversus immoderatas istiusmodi exæstuantis bilis redundantias armandos esse; quibus nunquam frœna laxantur donec ratio prævalet, quâ deficiente recurritur ad ea dicteria, ut claudus deficientibus tibiis ad equum. Mitto proinde quæ dicis gratis, Sanctorum invocationem *illicitam* esse, *idololatriam*, & *in Deum, ac Christum contumeliosam.* Tibi magis probrosum est ista dicere, quam nobis audire: quia *qui contumeliam profert, insipiens est.* Prov. x. 18. Quam iniquæ porrò sint istæ censuræ, postea patebit. Illud tantum hic observo, minus consideratè à te dici, nihil commune esse Sanctorum invocationi, & orationi pro mortuis, Contrarium asserueras supra, ubi dixisti fideles iis modis suam communionem cum Animabus tum Beatis in cælo, tum in abditis receptaculis suam beatitudinem expectan-

expectantibus testari. Communio igitur illa utrique communis est. Cæterum qui cum veritate pugnant, eos sibimetipsis manus inferre solemne est.

D. Morlæus p. 20. *Invocatio juxta Pontificios est vel summa, directa, absoluta, & terminativa, vel subalterna, indirecta, relativa, & transitiva. Prior est Latria, soli Deo debitus cultus: de quâ intelligi volunt, quidquid è sacris Scripturis, Conciliis, Patribusve producimus. Posteriorem putant Sanctis deberi, quos transitivè, & relativè invocandos esse docent, ita ut preces Sanctis oblatæ in Deum transeant, in eo terminentur. Et hanc innoxiam esse docent: & utilem, laudabilem, Deo Sanctisq; gratam.*

Resp. Agnoscimus distinctionem nostra est, & ad explicandum invocationis Sanctorum sensum apprimè conducens. Non enim ita Sanctos invocamus, ut in iis nostra hæreat intentio, aut orationes nostræ in iis subsistant, quasi à Sanctis præstari speraremus, quæ nobis usui sunt; sed ut suas ipsi nostris preces adjungant, quo multiplicatis intercessoribus illa certius à Deo impetremus, quæ petimus. Hinc orationes ipsis oblatæ sunt transitivæ, & relativæ, quia Deum ultimò respiciunt, ad Deum feruntur, & in eo solo quiescunt.

D. Morlæus. p. 21. *Nullum hujus invocationis relativæ vel præceptum, vel exemplum in sacris Scripturis, nec in praxi purioris Ecclesiæ, nec in ipsis Patribus reperitur; sed est purum: putum commentum ad excusandam hanc* Ἀγγελο λατρείαν, & Ἁγιολατρείαν *(cultum Angelorum, & Sanctorum) excogitatum.*

Resp. Mitte verba contumeliasque quæ, qui profert insipientem esse, pronuntiavit Regum sapientissimus. Rem ipsam vide invocationem inquam Sanctorum. Lege Sodes quas supra retuli sec. v. ex variis Liturgiis Sanctorum Invocationes: Ex iis constat nunquam in sacris omissam fuisse istam Sanctorum invocationem, quam tu solitâ tibi, tuisque symmistis modestiâ. *Commentum purum putumque* appellas. Simili temeritate negas ullum aut præceptum, aut exemplum ejus in S. Scripturis, aut Patribus, aut etiam in praxi veteris Ecclesiæ haberi. De Praxi veteris Ecclesiæ nos dubitare non sinunt illæ liturgiæ superius allatæ. De aliis modo dicendum.

SEC-

SECTIO VIII.

Ex S Scripturâ probatur Invocatio Sanctorum,

PRobatur 1, ex Geneseos XLVIII. *Angelus qui eruit me de cunctis malis*, ait Jacobus, *benedicat pueris istis; & invocetur super eos nomen meum, nomina quoque Patrum meorum Abraham, & Isaac.* Apertam hic habemus Angeli invocationem, nostræ similem id est relativam, & transitivam. Petere enim, ut Angelus eis benediceret, idem est ac si petiisset, ut pro iis oraret. Nam creaturæ cujuslibet benedicere, & bene precari: ac Dei Benedicere, est benefacere. Natalis Alexander O.P. vir eruditissimus testatur Temellium, Junium, atque Arnesium agnoscere, quod ea verba Angeli invocationem contineant sequentia verò continere Sanctorum invocationem, quia monet suum Patrumq; suorum nomen ab aliis invocandum.

Prob.2. Moyses ipse Sanctos Invocavit: Exodi XXXII. 13. *Recordare Domine Abrahaam, & Isaac, & Israel, servorum tuorum.* Quibus verbis eos velut mediatores, aut intercessores adhibuit. Et frequentissimæ fuerunt istorum trium invocationes ex eo tempore, qui videntur quasi populi Israelitici tutelares, sive Patroni. Factâ vero decem tribuum à Judâ secessione, tribus ista Davidem invocavit simili modo, propter cujus merita diu stetit & regia civitas, & ipsum Regnum, quod alioquin fuisset ob gravia populi Regumque illius peccata delendum.

Prob.3. Sancti post hanc vitam orant pro nobis. Petrus in posteriori sua Epist. 1. 15. *Dabo operam & frequenter habere vos post obitum meum, ut horum memoriam faciatis.* Quod idem est, ac polliceri se pro eorum pia vitâ post mortem oraturum. Præterea II. Mach. XV. 14. Hieremias dicitur multum orare pro populo Israel. Ibidem de Oniâ idem dicitur. Hieremiam gladium Iudæ Iudæorum Duci dedisse refertur, quo populi sui hostes debellaret. Respondent 1. libros illos Canonicos non esse: Verum hoc non satisfacit 1. Quia Ecclesia pro Canonicis jam Augustini tempore agnovit, 2. Quia saltem continent

veram

veram historiam quod ad præsens institutum sufficit. Respondent. 2. somnium fuisse. Fateor; sed somnium à Deo immissum & veram rerum futurarum revelationem in eo factam subsecuta victoria demonstravit.

Prob. 4. Hieremiæ xv. 1. negat Deus se Moysen, & Samuelem exauditurum, si pro populo intercederent & Ezech. xiv. 20. Simile quid de Noe, Daniele, & Iobo dicitur: eo quod planè constituisset contumacem illam gentem pœnis domare, ad quam convertendam frustra fuissent admonitiones minæque adhibitæ. Nec ullorum precibus se ab instituto dimoveri permissurus esset. Quorsum ista, nisi Deus Sanctorum intercessione subinde placaretur, & id populo illi tum temporis esset persuasum? Hoc etiam notatu dignum, quod cùm Christum in cruce pendentem Eliam invocasse dixissent ex adstantibus aliqui, (Matth. xxvii.) nemo ex Pharisæis, (qui in omnes ei calumnias struendi occasiones imminebant) eum propterea accusavit, quod haud omisissent, si quod Calvini grex sentit, sine Idololatriâ Sancti non invocantur.

Prob. 5. Sancti in hac vitâ & licitè & utiliter invocantur. Ergo & post hanc vitam. 1. Reg. vii. 8. ad Samuelem ait populus Israeliticus: *ne cesses pro nobis clamare ad Dominum Deum nostrum, ut salvet nos de manu Philistinorum.* Iob. xlii. 8. *Ite ad servum meum Iob, Iob autem servus meus orabit pro vobis, faciem ejus suscipiam, ut non vobis imputetur stultitia.* q. d. Intercessorem adhibete Iobum, ipsius pro vobis preces exaudiam, & quam meriti estis pœnam remittam. Et in novo instrumento: Rom. xv. 30. *Obsecro vos fratres per D. N. I. C. & per charitatem Sancti Spiritus, ut adjuvetis me in orationibus vestris pro me ad Deum, ut liberer ab infidelibus, qui sunt in Iudæâ.* Similis Sanctorum vivorum invocatio habetur Ephes. vi. 18. 19. & Colos. iv. 3. & 1. Thessal. v. 25. & 1. 25. & 11. Thessal. iii. 1. & Philip. 24. & Heb. xiii. 18. & Iac, v. 18. *Orate pro inimicem, ut salvemini.* Quare salvâ fide de Antecedenti dubitari non potest. Consequentia manifesta est: quia Sancti mortui non minus nos amant, quam vivi, ut pro nobis intercedere velint, nec minus Deo grati sunt, ut possint, quæ nobis usui sunt impetrare. Cur ergo non licebit

eos invocare, æquè ac illos? Hoc argumento usi sunt ad idem probandum Hieronymus, Augustinus, Chrysostomus, aliique infra citandi. Dixit aliquis Sanctos in hac vitâ invocari posse, quia sunt Christi membra, eorumque preces hujus meritis innituntur: quasi hæc in Sanctos etiã mortuos non competant, aut desinerent esse Christi membra, cum ipsi arctissimo, & indissolubili vinculo nectuntur, aut hujus meritis minus niterentur, quando sunt ei arctius conjuncti, & majora eorum virtute præmia sunt consecuti.

Quatuor modis huic argumento respondere conaris pag. 43. Negas itaq; consequentiam 1. quia præcepit Deus ut vivi pro vivis orarent, & promisit se tales orationes exauditurum: nihil simile de Sanctis mortuis. Cæterum nunquam vetuit Sanctos mortuos invocare: & gratis ex illo silentio solo infers istos invocandos non esse. Perinde quippe est, ac si ex eo, quod in Scriptura exempla nulla habeamus Invocationis Sanctorum aut Hispanorum, aut Gallorum, Britannorumve vivorum, inferres Græcos, & Romanos vivos invocari posse; alios non posse. Quæ restrictio cum gratis fiat, nullius est momenti: idem de restrictione tua ad Sanctos vivos, quæ gratis ficta est.

Negas Conseq. 2. quia in Scripturis sunt exempla Sanctorum vivorum pro invicem orantium, precesque petentium; at nullum de Defunctis invocatis. Nec hoc satisfecit: quia à Sanctis vivis invocatis ad Sanctos mortuos legitima est consequentia, & inevitabilis. 2. Quia & Sanctos mortuos orare pro vivis constat ex Scripturis, ut vidimus, & etiam eos fuisse Invocatos.

Negas 3. quia Sanctos vivos oramus, ut illum, qui solus invocandus est pro nobis, & nobiscum invocent: & ut una nobiscum per communem intercessorem Jesum Christum, Deum Patrem adeant. Cæterùm quid hoc ad rem, cum constet simili ratione ex Ecclesiæ mente invocari Sanctos mortuos, ut pro nobis, & nobiscum orent, Deum Patrem *Per Iesum Christum Dominum nostrum.*

SE-

SECTIO IX.

An, & quâ ratione Sancti mortui norunt, quæ hic aguntur.

POstrema, & maximè communis Asseclarum Calvini responsio à te his verbis exprimitur p.43. *Certò scimus Sanctos in hac vitâ sentire, & intelligere, quid sit quod ab illis præstari velimus; sed an Sancti mortui in cælo videant, quæ hic agimus, aut audiant, quæ loquimur certè scire non possumus, absque speciali revelatione.*

Ceterùm si demus tibi, quod gratis assumis & probare non potes, Sanctos Deo fruentes nostras preces non audire, quid inde mali, nisi quod opera in illis invocandis posita perierit? Idem evenire posse, dum Sanctos vivos, ut pro nobis orent. oramus, nec tu puto negabis, cum fieri possit, ut litteræ ad locoremotos destinatæ intercidant. Non tamen ideo damnabis ut Idololatram, aut ut impium, qui litteris ad Amicum in Indiâ degentem datis rogat, sui meminerit in precibus ad Deum: aut si hunc damnare audeas, vide quâ ratione B. Apostolum ab eâ sententiâ, eximas, nisi fingas, quoties epistolam aliquam ejusmodi preces continentem scriberet, peculiari revelatione certum factum esse, quod ad manus earum quibus destinabatur, esset perventura. Neque dicas, nos Beatis omniscientiam tribuere, quia dicimus quæcunque ubilibet aguntur cognoscere: & omnipotentiam, qui possunt nobis ubilibet constitutis opem ferre: quæ sunt duo Dei Attributa creaturis incommunicabilia. Respondebo enim, nos neutram illis tribuere; sed gratiam tantum apud Omnipotentem, & omniscientem, & eorum cognitionem, quæ illos scire Ecclesiæ est utile, cujus participes ex Divinâ bonitate fiunt, ad Ecclesiæ militantis bonum precibus suis procurandum.

Hæc dicta sunto, admissâ, non concessâ illâ Beatorũ de rebus, quæ hic aguntur, ignorantiâ. Nunc absolutè dico, id falsum, esse, quòd ii, qui hinc translati sunt quæ geruntur inter nos scire non possint.

Enimverò. Reg. XXVIII, constat Samuelem periculum Sauli imminens cognovisse, & futuram cladem etiam. Elias hinc raptus, quæ impius Joram Rex Juda contra Dei legem moliebatur, optimè novit eumque per epistolas comminatorias conatus est ad meliorem frugem reducere. II. Paralip. XXI 12. De quo vide Cornelium à Lapide ad illum locum, & Salianum, qui putat IX circiter annis ab Eliæ raptu missas fuisse illas Epistolas. Deinde ex laudato II. Mach. XV. 12. & seq. discimus Hieremiam & Oniam nosse periculum Judæis imminens: pro eo avertendo multum orasse, priorem Machabæo *Gladium* dedisse *Sanctum munus à Deo*, quo Gentis suæ hostes dejiceret. Id est, virtutem bellicam ad eos debellandos. Et inexpectata victoria subsecuta probavit non merum fuisse somnium; sed revelationem in somno factam, cujusmodi frequentes factæ fuerunt antiquitus, uti ex S. Litteris patet.

Ex novo Testamento clarius apparet id, quod cum Ecclesiâ assero. Luc. XIV. Dives epulo sepultus in Inferno, sciebat superstites esse ipsius quinque fratres, eosque tam perditè vivere, ut in summo essent damnationis periculo. Hoc sciebat & Abraham, & insuper eos habere Moysen, & Prophetas, hoc est eorum libros, quibus ad curandam salutem æternam, quantum sat esset, admonebantur. Ex quibus constat Animas corpore solutas, sive quæ in refrigerio erant in Abrahæ sinu, sive quæ torquebantur in Inferno, quæ hic agebantur cognovisse. Quo jure Beatas in cælo animas eâ cognitione privas, quam Christus Dominus animabus tum in limbo Patrum degentibus tum damnatis adscribit? Deinde idem Christus Dominus Luc. XV. 10 dicit: *Gaudium esse in cælo super uno peccatore pœnitentiam agente.* Sciunt ergo Beati quod Peccator aliquis Pœnitentiam agit, nec enim de re penitus ignotâ gaudere possunt: de ignoto enim objecto nec gaudium esse potest, si bonum est, neque tristitia, si malum.

Accedit & ratio: nam ad ipsorum Beatitatem spectare videtur, quod omne honestum ipsorum desiderium impleatur. Honestè autem desiderare possunt ea scirè quæ vel agunt, vel patiuntur primò ipsorum Parentes, filii, consanguinei, 2. illi, quarum curam in terrâ habue-

habuerunt, 3. alij noti, & vicini, 4. res ſpirituales majoris momenti, hæreſes, ſchiſmata; item Lætiora, nempe morum reformationes, Fidei propagationem, &c. 5. res etiam temporales, regnorum mutationes, Imperiorum tranſlationes, bellorum eventus, & id genus alia. Hinc Abraham, Iſaac & Jacob avere poſſunt, ſcire, quæ populo Iſraelitico eveniunt: David, Ludovicus, Henricus, Odoardus, quæ ipſorum regnis, Petrus, Pauluſque quæ toti Eccleſiæ, Antonius, Benedictus, Franciſcus, Ignatius, quæ cujuſque Inſtituti Profeſſoribus: Felix, quæ Nolæ, Gervaſius & Protaſius, quæ Mediolani, Genoueva quæ Pariſiis, quod ipſorum corpora illic ſepulta ſint. Denique quiſque Sanctus avere poteſt eos noſſe, qui in neceſſitate aliquâ conſtituti, eorum preces implorant.

A ſanctis Patribus longè amplior Beatis animabus cognitio tribuitur. Auguſtinus enim Tract. c1. in Joan. ſub finem ait: *Modicum & videbimus eum, ubi jam nihil rogemus, nihil interrogemus: quia nihil deſiderandum remanebit, nihil quærendum latebit.* Et Gregorius l. IV, Dialog. c. XXXIII. *Quid eſt quod neſciant, qui ſcientem omnia ſciunt?*

Quod ad modum, ſive medium ſpectat, in quo, vel per quod iſta intelligunt, quandoquidem illud Deus nec in verbo ſcripto, nec in non ſcriptis Traditionibus declarare dignatus ſit, nec Eccleſia quidquam definivit, ego libenter ignorantiam meam agnoſco. Poſſunt iſta cognoſcere per eos, qui hinc moriendo pergunt: poſſunt etiam per Angelos ea nuntiari. Poſſunt etiam Deo revelante ſcire: qui tres modi ab Auguſtino proponuntur I. de cura pro mortuis c XV. Poſtremus modus placere videtur Gregorio ſupra laudato: & clare aſſeritur à Concilio Senonenſi Decreto XIII, quod cum retuliſſet aliquos negare, Sanctos preces noſtras audire, ait: *Hoc quam ſit non modo veritati; ſed Scripturis quoque diſſonum facilè intelligit, qui Beatis pervium eſſe non ignorat omniforme illud Divinitatis Speculum, in quo quidquid eorum interſit, innoteſcat.* Et B. Auguſtinus hac ratione res creatas intelligi ab Angelis inſinuat, dum eorum cognitionem Matutinam eam eſſe dicit, quâ res in verbo cognoſcunt. Porrò dici poteſt haud ineptè Divina Eſſentia ob eam virtutem res repræſentandi *Speculum Voluntarium*; *Speculum*,

lum, quia res repræsentat : *voluntarium*, quia solum ea repræsentat, quæ Beatorum interest cognoscere, sive quæ ad eorum statum pertinent, & quæ Deus ab iis cognosci vult.

Denique illa scire possunt per vim innatam intellectui ipsorum. Hic quidem in corpore ratione sensuum à quibus in operando dependet : ad certam activitatis sphæram restringitur : at ubi corpore solutus est, & à sensuum cooperatione liber, non alios limites novit, quam qui res omnes existentes complectatur. Sicut ergo nos per Epistolas res in altero hemispherio gestas, & per historias res ante multa sæcula præteritas, cognoscimus nihil obstante aut loci, aut temporis distantiâ; ita intellectus Beatus vi suâ innatâ. Hoc, supposito, animas tantum à nobis distare, quantum à supremo cælo terra : licet incomperta nobis sit illarum à nobis distantia. (De quo vide Hieronymum l. contra Vigil.c.11.) Enim verò certum est, illas videre Deum: certum etiam est ubicunque sunt, eum videre, qui ubiq; est,& eum videndo beatas esse,etiamsi cum Christo Domino ad Inferos descendissent;quia earum Beatitudo non pendet à loco; sed in solâ Visione Dei consistit, quæ in omni loco eadem est. Simili ratione constat animas damnatas ubicunque sint, suam secum miseriam circumferre, suum infernum, etiamsi in Campis Elysiis, aut Insulis Fortunatis existant. Cum ergo ex earum Beatitudine, quæ fide certa est, de Distantiâ nihil nisi problematicè inferri possit, Distantia ipsarum à nobis incerta est : adeoq; inde colligi non potest, eas, quæ hic aguntur ignorare. Qui verò stolidè cavillatur Animas non tam longas aures habere, ut quæ hic aguntur, audiant longis auribus ornari meretur, & tintinnabulis, quod tam stupidum tam stolidum acumen ab eo solo proficisci potest, qui animam nihil sine corpore sentire, sive percipere posse autumet, adeoque eam sentiat esse merè corpus.

Dices: si quisque Beatus sciat, quæ ad ejus statum pertinent, sequeretur, ut subinde qui minus esset Beatus, ob minora merita, plura sciret, & per consequens magis erit Beatus. Quod multi ægrè sunt admissuri.

Resp, Concedo sequelam, tametsi enim in visione Beatificâ tota inæqua-

inæqualitas de facto à meritorum inæqualitate proficiscatur, & proinde qui majora habent merita, Deum perfectius vident: non ita tamen in visione rerum creatarum, quarum cognitio visioni Dei comparata non considerabile gaudium adfert. Audiamus August. lib. v. Confess. c. IV. *Infelix homo*, inquit, *qui scit illa omnia* (creata) *te autem nescit. Beatus autem qui te scit, etiamsi illa nesciat: qui verò te & illa novit, non propter illa Beatior est; sed propter te solum Beatus.* Et Christus ipse id *vitam æternam* esse testatur, *cognoscant solum Deum, & quem misit Iesum Christum.* Ioan. XVII. 3. aliorum cognitione, quantumvis amplâ insuper habitâ.

Quantumvis ergo non eam inficias difficile esse definitè scire, quâ ratione Beati videant, quæ hic aguntur, negari non debet eos ista videre. Similiter cum August. dicto l. de curâ pro mort. c. XVI. *Ista quæstio vires intelligentiæ meæ vincit, quemadmodum opitulentur Martyres iis, quos per eos certum est adjuvari.* &c. Certi sumus proinde Martyres scirè preces iis oblatas. 2. Eos nobis opem ferre. Quo verò modo utrumque fiat nihil admodum scire refert. Sed quocunque modo fiat pium, utileque est ad eos in necessitate recurrere eosque invocare.

SECTIO X.

Sanctorum invocatio probatur ex Patribus.

1. CYprianus epist. LVII. ad Cornelium: *si quis istinc nostrum prior divinæ dignationis celeritate præcesserit*, inquit, *perseveret apud Deum nostra dilectio, pro fratribus & sororibus nostris apud misericordiam Patris non cesset oratio.* Vide Pamelii ad illum locum annotationes. Deinde lib. de Disciplinâ & habitu virginum: *Durate fortiter, spiritualiter pergite, pervenite feliciter: tantum mementote tunc nostri, cum incipiet in vobis virginitas honorari.* Hæc clare probant ex illius mente Sanctos pro nobis orare, & nos illorum orationes implorare posse. Neque refert, quod Sanctos adhuc viventes alloquatur, (quod observat D. Morlæus pag. 38.) cum respiciat orationes post mortem fundendas: & ea dicat, quæ

eos

eos post mortem incitet ad orandum pro viventibus: adeoque Sanctorum in cælo regnantium invocationi æquivalent ea verba.

2. Potamiena Virgo, & Martyr Basilidi, qui eam ab impurorum ludibrio defenderat Martyrii coronam obtinuit, ut habet Eusebius l. ui. historiæ Eccles. c. v. Qui etiam l. xiii, Præpar. Evang c. xi. refert Christianos *hominum Deo Charissimorum sepulchra celebrare, preces ibi, votaque nuncupare & beatas illorum animas venerari consuevisse. Idque*, ait, *à nobis meritò fieri statuimus.*

3. Basilius Orat. ad xl. Martyres: *qui aliquâ premitur angustiâ*, inquit, *ad hos confugit: qui rursus lætatur, ad hos recurrit: ille ut à malis liberetur, hic ut duret in rebus lætis. Hic mulier orans pro filiis auditur: peregrinanti reditum incolumem, ægrotanti verò salutem implorat. O communes generis humani custodes! Optimi curarum socii, precum adjutores, Legati apud Deum potentissimi.*

4. Nyssenus, orat. de S. Theodoro M. *Intercede, ac deprecare pro Patriâ apud communem Regem, ac Dominum... Pete pacem, ut hi publici conventus non desinant. Nos enim, quod incolumes servati sumus, tibi acceptum referimus. Petimus autem etiam futuri temporis præsidium & securitatem. Quod si maiori etiam opus fuerit advocatione, & intercessione, fratrum tuorum Martyrum coge chorum, & cum omnibus unâ deprecare. Admone Petrum, excita Paulum, nec non Ioannem Theologum, ac dilectum discipulum, ut pro Ecclesiis, quas constituerunt soliciti sint.*

D. Morlæus p. 48. *Basilium, Nyssenum, Nazianzenum, Paulinum, atque Prudentium, pios; eruditos, & in suo genere admirabiles sentio, tamen illorum sequacibus gravissimum errorem errandi dederunt occasionem, dum Rhetorico & Poëtico suo genio nimis indulgent, adeoque incautius loquuntur.*

Resp. accipimus, quod à te veritas manifesta extorsit, nimirum, Hos Patres (quanta nomina) Sanctorum invocationem docuisse: nosque hac in re illos Sanctos viros imitari. Dum tamen addis gravissimum errorem errandi datā nobis ab illis occasionem, aut falleris, aut quod gravius est Lectores fallis. 1. Quia non error; sed Ecclesiæ doctrina. 2. Quia non docuerunt ipsi Ecclesiam illud dogma; sed ab Ecclesia didicerunt: nec unquam Ecclesia eorum Panegyres audisset patienter,

patienter, aut legisset poemata, si (quod dicitis) credidisset Sanctorum invocationem, *erroneam* doctrinam esse aut *impiam*, atque *superstitiosam*. imò *idolatricam*. Cæterum ex claris istorum Patrum sententiis si quæ sint apud alios Patres obscuriores, aut dubiæ, exponi debent.

S.Hieronymus Epist.XXVII. quæ ait Epitaphium Paulæ: *Vale ô Paula*, inquit, *& cultoris tui ultimam senectutem orationibus juva. Fides, & opera tua te Christo sociant: præsens quod postulas, facilius impetrabis.*

D.Morlæus pag.49. *Hieronymus Poëtarum more scribit... Et aut ineptus fuit Paulam non audientem seriò alloquendo, aut ineptior non audientem seriò invocando.*

Resp. alii longe diversam de Hieronymi sensu sententiam habent: & ex ejus verbis citius credent Beatas animas, quæ dicimus audire: quam ob tam futilem rationem Sanctum Doctorum ineptire.

S.Ambrosius lib.de Viduis: *Obsecrandi sunt Angeli pro nobis*, inquit, *qui nobis ad præsidium dati sunt: Martyres obsecrandi, quorum videmur nobis quodam corporis pignore Patrocinium vindicare. Possunt pro peccatis nostris rogare, qui proprio Sanguine etiamsi quæ habuerunt peccata laverunt. Isti enim sunt Dei Martyres, nostri præsules, speculatores vitæ, actuumq; nostrorum. Non erubescamus eos intercessores nostræ infirmitatis adhibere, qui & ipsi infirmitatem corporis, etiam cum viverent cognoscebant.*

D.Morlæus p.47.hariolatur,dum audacter pronuntiat Ambrosium, si scripsisset Retractationes suorum operum, hanc sententiam nigro carbone noraturum fuisse. Sed unde id colligit? Hujusmodi assertiones, qui sine probatione protrudit,non mente:sed fronte solâ loquitur. Addit p.48. *Ambrosium vix Christianum in libro de Viduis vix Christiane scripsisse.* Quominus inverecundam istam immodestiam meritâ verborum acerbitate castigemus,facit ipsius immodestiæ magnitudo,quam nulla verborum acerbitas æquabit. Adeo scilicet apertè adversantur tibi ista verba, ut, cum fiduciis etiam admotis ea detorquere non potueris, bilem, inde commotam,& in ea verba, & in eorum Authorem hæretico furore percitus, evomere volueris.

7.Idem Ambrosius Epist. LIII. refert inventum cum corporibus

Sanctorum Gervasii, & Protasii scriptum cujusdam Philippi, qui illa corpora furtim sustulerat, atque ea in domo suâ sepelierat, *Credens eorum orationibus se consequi misericordiam Domini nostri Iesum Christi.* Prout in eo scripto habetur. Unde colligo vel primo, vel certè secundò sæculo Sanctorum invocationem obtinuisse; & martyrum Reliquias religiosè cultas fuisse; quia aut sub *Nerone* aut certè sub *Marco Aurelio* Martyrium consummarunt isti, quorum corpora piè recondidit dictus Philippus, iis contemporaneus.

8. Ad Hieronymum revertor. Is l. contra Vigilantium: *Dicis in libello tuo, quod dum vivimus, mutuo pro nobis orare possumus, postquam autem mortui fuerimus nullius sit pro alio exaudienda Oratio. Si Apostoli & Martyres adhuc in corpore constituti possunt orare pro cæteris, quando pro se adhuc debent esse solliciti, quantò magis post coronas, victorias, triumphos? Vnus homo Moyses sexcentis millibus armatorum impetrat à Domino veniam, & Stephanus imitator Domini sui, & primus Martyr in Christo pro persecutoribus veniam deprecatur & postquam cum Christo esse cœperint minus valebunt?*

D. Morlæus p. 50. *Vigilantius tria tuetur: 1. Martyres seu Sanctos non esse adorandos. 2. Mortuos pro vivis non intercedere. 3. Martyrum animas non adesse suis tumulis. De duobus posterioribus Hieronymus acriter disputat, de primo litem illi nullam movet.*

Resp. *In malâ causâ non potes aliter*, ait Aug. *sed quis coëgit te malam causam habere?* Adeamus ipsum librum, & videamus an non fide Calvinianâ, & Protestanticâ hoc tam asseveranter dicas. Hæc sunt Hieronymi verba ad Riparium, Epist. 1111. *Honoramus Reliquias Martyrum, ut eum cujus sunt Martyres adoremus. Honoramus servos, ut honor servorum redundet ad Dominum, qui ait, qui vos suscipit, me suscipit.* Et l. 1. adversus Vigilantium. *Dolet Martyrum Reliquias precioso operiri velamine, & non vel pannis, vel cilicio colligari, vel projici in sterquilinio ut solus Vigilantius ebrius, & dormiens adoretur. Ergo sacrilegi sumus, quando Apostolorum Basilicas ingredimur? sacrilegus fuit Constantinus Imperator, qui Sanctas Reliquias, Andreæ, Lucæ, & Timothei transtulit Constantinopolim, apudquas Dæmones rugiunt, & inhabitatores Vigilantii illorum se sentire præsentiam confitentur? Sacrilegus dicendus est Arcadius, qui ossa Beati Samuelis .. de Iudaâ transtulit in Thraciam?*

ciam? Omnes Episcopi non solum sacrilegi, sed etiam fatui judicandi, qui rem vilissimam ut cineres in serico, & vase aureo portaverunt? stulti omnium Ecclesiarum populi, qui occurrerunt sacris Reliquiis, & tantâ lætitiâ quasi viventes Prophetam cernerent, susceperunt, ut de Palestinâ usque Chalcedonem jungerentur populorum examina, & in Christi laudem unâ voce resonarent? Videlicet adorabant Samuelem; & non Christum, cujus Samuel & Levita, & Prophetes fuit. Nunc, & quâ soles fiduciâ dicito, S. Hieronymum de Martyrum honore nullam Vigilantio litem movisse, in quem tantâ verborum acrimoniâ, tantâ rationum vi pugnat.

August. l. de curâ pro mortuis c. IV. *Cum recolit animus ubi sepultum est charissimi corpus, & occurrit locus nomine Martyris venerabilis, eidem Martyri animam dilectam commendat, recordantis, & precantis affectus.* Quibus verbis simul conjungit & orationem pro mortuis, & Sanctorum invocationem.

D. Morlæus p. 56. citatis ex eodem capite ejusdem libri verbis aliquibus ex Bellarmino, hæc addit: *Hæc sunt à Bellarmino citata, quæ ut verum apud te non dissimulem primâ facie aliquantulum me moverunt. Quare cum fidem Iesuiticam non ignorarem Augustinum ipsum statim consului, totumque contextum imo integrum librum legi, & relegi. Et primum animadverto disjuncta esse in Augustino, quæ in Bellarmino conjuncta sunt.* &c. Hæc porro sunt à Bellarmino citata verba: *non video quod sit adjumentum mortuorum provisus sepeliendis corporibus apud memorias Sanctorum locus, nisi ad hos ut dum ubi sunt reposita eorum, quos diligunt corpora, iisdem Sanctis illos tanquam Patronis susceptos, apud Dominum adjuvandos orando commendent.*

Respondeo: *fidem Iesuiticam*, quam hic vellicas, longè facillimum est præstare, cum (ut legenti locum citatum potest, ea verba omnia, licet aliquantulum mutato ordine, in illo capite extent. Et ne quis suspicetur loci sensum immutatum esse, illum eundem exhibent verba, quæ ex illo loco produxi: quæ paucis interjectis, verba quæ Bellarminus protulit sequuntur: adeoque demonstrant sensum à Bellarmino intentum Augustini esse: nec per consequens satis cohærere cum Augustini mente, quem illi affingis: qui sensus tibi obvius occurrisset, si potius eum quærere, quam ab eo declinare, & aberrare,

conatus fuisses. Quid tantum insanó licuit indulgere labori, ut totum librum iterum iterumque legeres, (cum verba ab Eminentissimo velis nolis Authore prolata in oculos incurrant) non alium in finem, quam ut sensum extonderes ipsi Augustino contrarium, quem ipse sequenti suæ mentis expositione dispunxit?

Boni consulis, si datâ per imprudentiam tuam, hac occasione lubricæ, fallacis, fraudulentæque *fidei vestræ verè Protestanticæ* mentionem injiciam quando tibi visus est *Iesuiticam* Bellarminus *fidem* objicere. Quâ ratione quâ fiduciâ fidem *Iesuitarum* suggillatis, qui tot errores &c. Qui tot errores in fide, tot mendacia in communi hominum convictu, *tot perjuria publica* non impunè modo grassari passi estis (quod ipsum sat magnum crimen esset) sed amplissimis præmiis fovistis, & totis ingenii viribus propugnastis; nec aut verecundia hominum, aut conscientiæ remurmurantis sensu, aut justitiæ amore, sed metu solo malorum, Regno, Regiæ familiæ, ordiniq; Ministellorum à fanaticis hominibus, ea omnia in Regni perniciem, summo studio promoventibus ut per Catholicorum præsertim verò Jesuitarum excidium, ad Regni, ad publici Regiminis eversionem pervenirent, imminentium, (quæ non tam prævidebatis; quam sentiebatis) resipuistis. Hæc non in obscuris Angulis facta; sed palam, sed in conspectu solis, sed in oculis omnium gesta sunt. Dicito ubi aliquid simile non dico à Jesuitis actum; sed vel à Barbaris gentibus designatum est. Et *tu fidem Iesuiticam* nominasti! Quærito ignotas gentes, *Anglicæ verè Protestanticæ fidei* ignaras, rerum quæ à quinquennio gestæ sunt inscias, apud quam fidem vestram jactetis, Jesuitarum verò convellatis. Trabem istam ex oculo vestro ejicite: tum videre poteritis an ulla sit in Iesuitarum oculo palea.

Aliqua dicam obiter de hoc Augustini libro quem *de curâ pro mortuis* inscripsit. Ex eo varia fidei Catholicæ cum Hæreticis controversa capita confirmantur. Primò, Templa in honorem Martyrum constructa. 2. Corpora fidelium illic sepulta fuisse. 3. Idque ex opinione, quod illis prodesset illic sepeliri. 4. Orationes pro defunctis. 5. Solis illis Animabus istas prodesse, quæ & refrigerio carebant, & illius capaces

capaces erant, 6. Martyrum pro iis implorata suffragia. 7. Martyrum intercessione multa à Deo donari. 8. Martyres apparere. Sic Felix Nolæ apparuit.

Hæc omnia testatur Augustinus Catholicos communiter credidisse: & Paulinus eidem contestis est. Nec his in rebus magis clarum de mente priscæ Ecclesiæ testimonium optarem, quam quod iste liber exhibet.

Nec hujus testimonii vigori quidquam detrahit Augustini dubitatio, de verâ ratione, quâ nitebatur ista praxis, aut utilitate inde manante. Fusè probat Christianos solicitos esse non debere de sepulchro, ob Christi verba: *Nolite timere eos qui occidunt corpus, & post hoc non habent amplius quod faciant*: ut eos consolaretur, quorum amici, affines, & consanguinei in clade Romanâ occisi fuerant, eorumque corpora insepulta Avibus cęli, & bestiis terræ laceranda relicta sunt. Cumque totam ejus mentem occuparet (dum librum istum scriberet) consolationis illis impertiendæ desiderium, vix tenui rimâ claram lucem admisit ex Ecclesiæ praxi derivatam, quam & avarè distribuit, ne afflictos affligeret, de sepulchri alieni jacturâ mæstos, de suo solicitos. Inde credo factum, quod non adeo commendaverit illud Fidelium studium, de quærendo apud Martyrum memorias sepulchro; sed potius diminuere, quantum poterat, salva veritate, videatur.

Quod ergo Augustinus praxim illam fidelium referat, cum Paulino, eamque verbis & à Bellarmino, & à me prolatis approbat, id manifestæ rei veritati tribuendum: quod verò in dandâ hujus praxeos ratione, fructuque explicando, quem inde adipiscerentur fideles, minus firmus videatur, neque totis ingenii sui viribus praxim illam commendat, id dandum puto fidelium dolori, à Romanâ clade, & insepultis cadaveribus orto. Eundem tamen fidelium illius temporis, & Ecclesiæ hodiernæ sensum esse, per eandem praxim, ex Augustino manifestè patet. Unde constat non nova esse dogmata, quæ Catholici contra modernos hæreticos asserimus; sed communia priscis: quæ Augustinus & novit, & agnovit, & laudavit, sed hoc ultimum parcè admodum. Hinc apud æquos quosque Judices constabit Bel-

larmino fides, & tua, mi Morlęe, in illum iniquitas, illum de malâ fide sine justâ causâ, & accusas, & condemnas falsus Testis, corruptus Judex.

SECTIO XI.

Rationibus Theologicis probatur Sanctorum Invocatio.

PRima ducitur ex Liturgiis, quarum nulla est, quæ non aliquam Sanctorum Invocationem, potissimùm B. Mariæ Deiparæ Virginis. Eruditissimus P. Natalis Alexander dubitat an aliquæ Liturgiæ eorum sint, quorum nomina pręferunt, eo quod voces aliquas contineant, quas posteriora sæcula invexerunt. At argumentum inefficax est: quia Liturgiæ cum sint publici juris, & non tam ab aliquo homine, ut talis est, quam ab eo, ut Episcopus, est, proficiscantur, sintque potius partes Auctoritatis, quam ingenii. Inde fit, ut datâ occasione jure suo usi sint, primi Auctoris successores ad eas augendas, & locupletandas: non tamen novarum accessione partium; sed priorum partium incremento: ad eum modum, quo corpus humanum augetur: in quo ab ipsis initiis caput, manus pedes, item cor, cerebrum, illa, eadem, quæ novæ materiæ accessione, & proportionata adjectione crescit in mensuram virilem.

Partes verò Liturgiarum essentiales & primigeniæ sunt 1. quæ ad Symbolorum Consecrationem in Dei honorem & Passionis Dominicæ memoriam spectant. 2. Oratio vel Invocatio Sanctorum. 3. Oratio pro defunctis in his enim omnes omnino Liturgiæ conveniunt.

Probatur 2. ex eo quod nunquam altare constitutum fuerit, sine Martyrum Reliquiis. Et Ecclesiæ ipsæ *Memoriæ Martyrum* dictæ sunt. Hinc constat magnum honorem illis exhibitum: quem etiam exhibet hodieque Ecclesia Romana, Græca, aliæ; sola Protestantica ut ab Ecclesiis hujus temporis, ita ab omnibus Antiquis differret, ab omnium æquè pietate, & Sanctitate, ac à moribus, & praxi defecit.

Prob. 3, Quia Pagani, cum à Christianis impugnarentur ob honores

res divinos hominibus mortuis exhibitos, responderunt ipsosmet Christianos similem cultum mortuis exhibere, Martyres honorando.

Prob. 4. quia Christiani Ethnicis respondentes agnoscunt se Martyres colere, eorumque sepulchra venerari eos invocare; sed non ut Deos; sed ut Dei famulos, Deo gratos, apud eum potentes, quorum precibus se juvari apud eundem Deum sperabant. Hujus rei testimonia infra producentur.

Prob. 5. Patres, qui de Invocatione Sanctorum locuti sunt, non ut de re nova; sed ut de antiquitùs usurpata loquuntur. Nec ullum è sanctis Patribus invenire est, qui eam novam dixerit esse, prioribus ignotam, suo, aut ullo alio Apostolis posteriori tempore inventam. Quod evidenter probat, Euangelio coævam esse Martyres invocandi consuetudinem.

Prob. denique 6. quia qui Martyres invocandos negarunt, Vigilantius, & alii, velut Hæretici condemnati sunt ab Ecclesiâ. Quod patet ex Epiphanio, Augustino, atque Hieronymo. Ergo non solum sensit unus, aut alter è Patribus, sed etiam ipsa Ecclesia, Martyres invocandos esse: eorumq; Invocationem ad fidem spectare Catholicam. Alioqui non censeret à fide extorres fieri, quotquot aliter sentirent.

Plura alia ex Patribus adduci possunt Argumenta, ex Irenæo, Athanasio, Ephrem Syro, aliisque sed ista sufficiunt. Unum addam ex August. serm. 11. de Annuntiatione. *Sancta Maria, succurre miseris, juva pusillanimes, refove flebiles, ora pro populo, interveni pro clero, intercede pro devoto fæmineo sexu. Sentiant omnes tuum juvamen* &c.

Claudo ingens testimoniorum agmen unico Chrysostomi testimonio, quod non solum invocandos esse Sanctos docet; sed etiam quid à nobis præstari debeat, ut nobis illæ fructuosæ sint invocationes. Ait ipse hom. 1. in priorem ad Thessalon. *Hæc cum ita sint, nos nec Sanctorum pro nobis negligere debemus orationes, nec omnem fiduciam in illis collocare: quia aliud res ingenti subsidio privaret, aliud desides redderet. Debemus ergo & ipsos orare, ut pro nobis orent, & ipsi piè vivere, ut illam assequi mereamur beatitudinem, quæ promittitur diligentibus Deum, per gratiam Domini nostri Iesu Christi.*

Quare

Quare & utriusque Testamenti tabulæ, & antiqua purioris (ut loqui amatis) Ecclesiæ praxis, & antiquorum Patrum indubitata testimonia invice probant Martyres. Angelos, sanctosque invocandos esse. Adeoque cultum illum improbari non posse salvâ fide, à quâ naufragaverunt quicumq; illum impugnarunt. Quemque Ἀγγελολατρίαν, & Ἁγιολατρίαν odiosis vocabulis appellare mavis, quam Ἀγγελοδουλίαν, & Ἁγιοδουλίαν, nihil opus est dicas. Ignorare non potes, nos juxta vobiscum sentire λατρίαν cultum esse soli Deo debitum. Adeoque non minus aversamur ipsi Ἀγγελολατρίαν, quam tuæ sectæ homines. Idem de Ἁγιολατρίαν. Sed insidias incauto Lectori in verbo struxisti: quas tibi inutiles reddit hæc observatio.

SECTIO XII.

Apud Christianos Sanctorum invocantio, non convenit cum cultu Dæmonum apud Ethnicos.

D. Morlæus. p. 21. *Quæ* Ἀγγελολατρία, & Ἁγιολατρία *cum gentilium* Δαιμονολατρίᾳ *eadem res est aliis nominibus fucata, & ex Gentilium Philosophia in Christianam Ecclesiam paulatim introducta, non obstante Apostoli Pauli diligentissimâ per totum caput secundum ad Colossenses præmonitione, ut ab istâ Gentilium Philosophiâ sibi caveant Christiani.*

Resp. Ex Gentilium Philosophiâ nasci non potuit Sanctorum Invocatio, cum ista totâ Philosophiâ Ethnicâ antiquior fuerit. Vidimus enim Jacob Patriarcham Angelum invocasse: Hic autem diu ante Philosophiam Paganam vixit. Imo Moyses, qui quadringentis post Jacob annis floruit, cunctis ipsis Gentilium Diis antiquior est, ut ostendam infra sect. XVI, & expressè tradit Eusebius Præfatione in Chronicon. Falsissima proinde est illa tua assertio, quæ in re tanti momenti, sine probatione adduci non debuit.

Neque te decet sine ratione asserere toto capite secundo epistolę ad Colossenses Apostolum fideles admonuisse, caverent sibi ab istâ Gentilium Philosophiâ: sed Sodales tuos in hoc imitaris, qui, cùm deficiunt

ciunt rationes solidæ, & testimonia clara, ad obscurissimas Prophetias, & abstrusiores sententias, quas ad exercitium, & humiliationem intellectus humani Spiritus Sanctus per SS. Scripturas ubique dispersit, recurrunt. *Talia malam causam vel moras faciendo sustentant*, ait in simili Augustinus.

Falsum etiam esse, quod dicis, manifestè patet: nam quæ versu 16. dicuntur: *Nemo vos judicet in cibo, aut in potu aut in parte diei festi, aut neomeniæ, aut sabbathorum, quæ sunt umbra futurorum.* Hæc inquam clariùs legales ceremonias, id est Judaicos ritus, improbant, quam ut id probari opus sit. Item illa versus 20. 21. *Si ergo mortui estis cum Christo ab elementis hujus mundi, quid adhuc tanquam viventes in mundo decernitis? Ne tetigeritis, neque gestaveritis, neque contrectaveritis....* Cum ergo manifestè pateat, aliquam illius orationis partem de solis Iudaicis ritibus intelligi posse, quidni dicere possumus alia, quæ obscura sunt, de iisdem intelligi debere? Nec enim verba clara per obscura implicari debent; sed è contra obscura per clara explicari. Hoc saltem negari non potest, tuam assertionem falsissimam esse, quæ dicit toto capite moneri Christianos, caverent sibi à Gentilium Philosophiâ.

Sed si demus tibi Gentium Philosophiam eo loci intelligi ab Apostolo, cur non de Epicureis speciatim, & stoicis id accipi poterit, quos cum Apostolo *disseruisse*, sive disputasse, testis est Lucas Actor. XVII. 18. Et verò de his speciatim locutum Apostolum, testis est Tertullianus lib. de Præscript. *Fuerat Athenis*, inquit, *& istam sapientiam humanam, adsectatricem, & interpolatricem veritatis de congressibus noverat*, & lib. de Animâ cap. 1. *Athenis expertus*; scilicet Apostolus, *Linguatam Civitatem, cum omnes illic sapientiæ, facundiæ caupones degustasset, inde concepit præmonitorium illud dictum.* Hæc Tertullianus. Si ex eo congressu cum *Stoicis* & *Epicureis* concepit illud decretum, non potuit adversus Gentilium superstitiosum Deorum suorum cultum dirigi, cum illæ duæ Philosophorum sectæ præ aliis omnibus nedum à superstitioso, verum etiam à Religioso suo-

rum Deorum cultu ita abhorruerint, ut Atheismo eam ob causam præ aliis fuerint infamati.

D. Morlæus pag. 34. *Laodicena* cap. XXXV. *Cultum Angelorum occultam Idolalatriam vocat, eumque sub Anathemate prohibet. Et Theodoretus in cap.* 11. *Epist. ad Colos.* v.18. *Qui legi patrocinabantur*, ait, *Colossenses ad cultum Angelorum induxerant : quæ prava affectio permansit apud multos in Phrygiâ, & Pisidiâ. Quamobrem vetuit Synodus Laodicena, nequis Angelis supplicaret.*

Resp. Constat neminem magis commendasse Religiosum Sanctorum, Angelorumque cultum, eorumque invocationem, quam Theodoretum quod probabitur Sect. XVIII. Hanc ergo non potuit Theodoretus aut damnare ipse, aut credere ab illâ Synodo fuisse damnatam. Alium ergo cultum intelligit, qui quis sit modo quærendum. 1. Credo fuisse cultum magicum, quo non solum Dæmones, sed etiam Angeli boni, invocabantur. De quo Tertullianus Apolog. c. XXIII. Anselmus, & Turrianus. Magicum autem, atque superstitiosum etiam bonorum Angelorum cultum damnat etiamnum Ecclesia.

Resp. 2. Simonem, Menandrum, Saturninum, Cerinthum, Basilidem, aliosque semi-Iudæos existimasse per Angelos tanquam per minores Deos conditum hunc mundum, ab iisq; eum administrari, per Prophetas eos docere nos, &c. Quos refutat Apostolus Ephes. 1. & Heb. 1. Christum Dominum Angelis majorem asserens. Ex quo consequens erat, majorem ab iis hæreticis honorem Angelis delatum, quam puræ creaturæ deberetur, cujusmodi ipsi Angeli sunt. Hunc autem honoris excessum Synodus meritò damnare potuit. Videatur Cornelius à Lapide in l. 1. Epistolæ ad Colossenses.

Resp. 3. Ubi populus in rebus aut licitis, aut etiam bonis, nimiam fiduciam collocat, neglectis aliis melioribus, fieri potest, ut justè prohibeatur illarum rerum, tametsi de se bonæ sint, usus. Sic haud ita pridem audio in Hibernià contigisse, ut ad tempus usus aquæ benedictæ interdictus fuerit, quod in gente illâ non pauci

pauci tanti facerent eam aquam, ut ipsum Pœnitentiæ Sacramentum susque deque habere viderentur. Aliquid ejusmodi intervenisse credibilius est, quam aut Synodum Laodicenam, aut Theodoretum Sanctorum Invocationem, qualis est modo, & fuit tunc temporis in usu, improbasse.

Resp. 4. Cum illa Synodus cap. XXXIV. non omnes; sed tantùm malos, falsosque Hæreticorum Martyres coli vetuerit, (unde sequitur bonorum, & qui in Orthodoxæ fidei Professione Martyrium absolverunt, cultum non prohiberi) videtur Canone sequenti non omnium Angelorum; sed malorum tantum, cultum prohibere. Et similis in utroque Canone loquendi modus huic interpretationi favet. Nam Canone XXXIV. vetat *nos deserere Martyrem Christi, & ire ad Pseudo-Martyres, quos constat fuisse Hæreticos.* Et Canone XXXV. vetat *deserere Ecclesiam Dei, & Angelos nominare, & congregationes facere.* Vbi vetat segregare plebem ab Ecclesiâ Catholicâ, inusitatis in eâ Angelorum nominibus adhibitis, & Conventicula facere. Hoc est, schismata facientes, & inconsutilem Christi tunicam lacerantes, anathemate ferit.

D. Morlæus p. 34. *Non dubium est, quin eadem Synodus eodem Anathematis fulmine percussisset Sanctorum Invocatores, si qui tales extitissent.*

Resp. Tales extitisse, qui Sanctos invocabant, liquet 1. Ex Ethnicorum objectionibus. 2. Ex Patrum, nominatim Theodoreti scriptis. Nec tamen fuerunt condemnati. Vnde colligitur non ob solum Angelorum cultum pium, qualis est, semperque fuit in Ecclesiâ, editum illud Decretum; sed alias ob causas, ut vidimus.

SECTIO XIII.

Quid Gentiles de uno Deo, ejusque Prudentiâ & cultu senserint?

D. Morlæus p. 21. *Gentilium Philosophi, non minus quam Christiani, unum summum Deum, cui summus, & supremus cultus debebatur, & quam* Δημιουργὸν *appellabant agnoscebant.*

Resp. Non Philosophos solos; sed omnes omnino homines, insitam eorum mentibus, infixamque naturaliter habere Dei notionem aliquam indubitatum est. *Signatum est super nos lumen vultus sui Dominus: & tam expressis lineamentis*, tam altè sculptis figuris impressum, ut nec barbarorum ferarum ritu viventium ignorantia, nec grata sensibus, moribus perniciosa Poëtarum figmenta, nec pomposa Idolorum magno ceremoniarum apparatu cultorum adoratio, eam debere unquam potuerit. Hanc naturalem Dei Idæam primus observavit Epicurus, si fides Ciceroni lib. 1. de naturâ Deorum; quæ vim suam adeo in omnibus gentibus exeruit, ut nulla natio, nullum hominum genus. Sine omni Dei notitiâ vixerit unquam. Consentiunt Patres. Clemens Alexand. Parçn. ad Gentes: *Omnibus, ut semel dicam hominibus instillatus est quidam Divinus influxus, quâ de causâ vel inviti fatentur, unum esse Deum, ab interitu alienum, & ingenitum.* Cyprianus lib. de Idolo. Vanitate: *Deum ignorare non potes.* Basilius in Psalm. XLVIII. *Hominibus vis in est, quâ Creatorem suum & opificem agnoscere possit, & intelligere. Insufflavit enim in faciem, hoc est partem aliquam gratiæ apposuit homini, ut per hanc sibi impressam similitudinem, eum cui similis est agnosceret.* Hieronymus in cap. 1. Epist. ad Galatas, ad verba: *Cum autem placuit ei*, &c. ait: *Ex quo perspicuum est, naturâ omnibus Dei inesse notitiam.* Prosper l. de Provid.

Seu nostros annos, seu tempora prisca revolvas,
Esse omnes sensêre Deum.

Dama-

Damascenus lib. I. de fide cap. I. *haudquaquam nos deseruit Deus omnimodâ sui circumfusos ignorantiâ; quin imò cunctis cognitio, quod Deus est, ab ipso naturaliter insita est, atque ingenita.* Vide Nazianzenum Orat. XXIV, & alios.

Tertullianus I. de Resurrectione carnis post principium: *Quædam naturâ nota sunt,* inquit, *ut immortalitas animæ penes plures: & Deus noster penes omnes.* Et libro de Testimonio Animæ: *Novum Testimonium advoco,* inquit, *imò omni litteratura notius omni doctrinâ agitatius, omni editione vulgatius, toto homine majus, id est, totum quod est hominis. Consiste in medio Anima, sive divina & æterna res es, secundum plures Philosophos, eo magis non mentiens: seu minimè divina, ut Epicuro soli videtur.... sed non eam advoce, quæ scholis formata, bibliothecis exercita, Academicis, & Porticibus parta sapientia ructas. Te simplicem, & rudem, & impolitam, & idioticam compello qualem te habent, qui te solam habent, illam ipsam de compito, de trivio, de extrino totam. Imperitiâ tuâ mihi opus est, quoniam aliquantula tuæ peritiæ nemo credit. Ea expostulo, quæ tecum in hominem infers; quæ aut ex temetipsâ, aut ex quocumque Auctore tuo sentire didicisti. Non, quod sciam, Christiani: fieri enim, non nasci solet Christiana. Tamen nunc à te testimonium flagitant Christiani, ab extraneâ adversus tuos, ut vel tibi erubescant, qui nos odierint, & irrideant, quæ te nunc consciam detinent. Non placemus Dominum prædicantes, hoc nomine unico unicum, à quo omnia, & sub quo universa. Dic testimonium, si ita scis. Nam te palam, & totâ libertate quâ non licet nobis, domi ac foris audimus ita pronuntiare: quod Deus dederit, & si Deus voluerit: eâ voce & aliquem esse significas, & omnem illi confiteris potestatem, ad cujus spectat voluntatem, simul, & cæteros negas Deos esse, dum suis vocabulis nuncupas, Saturnum, Iovem: Nam solum Deum confirmas, quem tantum Deum nominas, ut & cum illos Deos interdum appellas, & alieno, & quasi prò mutuo usu videaris.*

Et Apologetici c. XVII. *Quod colimus,* inquit, *Deus unus est.* Et infra: *Deum vis magnitudinis & natum hominibus objecit, & ignotum: & hæc est summa delicti, nolentium recognoscere, quem ignorare non possunt. Vultis ex operibus ipsius... vultis ex animæ ipsius testimonio comprobemus? quæ licet carcere corporis pressa, licet institutionibus pravis circumscripta licet libidinibus & concupiscentiis evigorata, licet falsis Diis exancillata, cum tamen respicit, ut ex-*

crapulâ, ut ex somno, ut ex aliquâ valetudine, & sanitatem suam patitur, & Deum nominat solum, quia proprie hic unus Deus, bonus, & magnus. Et quod Deus dederit, omnium vox est. Iudicem quoque contestatur, illum: Deus videt, & Deo commendo, & Deus mihi reddet. O Testimonium Animæ naturaliter Christianæ! Denique pronuncians hæc, non ad Capitolium; sed ad cælum respicit. Novit enim sedem Dei vivi.

Cyprianus l. de Idolorum vanitate, eodem Tertulliani telo pugnat: *Vulgus in multis Deum naturaliter confitetur, cum mens, & anima sui Auctoris, & Principis admonetur. Dici frequenter audimus, ô Deus, & Deus videt, & Deo commendo, & Deus mihi reddat, & quod vult Deus, & si Deus dederit. Atque hæc est summa delicti, nolle agnoscere, quod ignorare non possis.* Hæc ibi. Exprobrat autem uterque Ethnicis, quod peccarent nolendo Deum agnoscere, quem ignorare non poterant.

Minutius felix: *Audio vulgus, cum ad cælum manus tendunt, nihil aliud, quam Deum dicunt, & Deus magnus est. Vulgi iste naturalis Sermo* est, *an Christianis confitentis Oratio?*

Lactantius: *Cum jurant, & cum optant, & cum gratias agunt, non Deos multos; sed Deum nominant: adeo ipsa veritas cogente naturâ, etiam ab invitis pectoribus erumpit.* Iterum: *Ad Deum confugiunt, à Deo petitur auxilium, Deus, ut subveniat, oratur. Etsi quis ad extremam mendicandi necessitatem redactus, victum precibus exposcit, Deum solum obtestatur, & per ejus divinum & unicum Numen hominum sibi misericordiam quærit.* Simile quid habet Proclus in Timæum Platonis.

Denique Eusebius lib. 11. de Præpar. Euang. c. IX. initio: *Nos autem dicere non dubitamus,* inquit, *naturâ, imo verò Divinitus esse hominibus insitum, non solum utile quid, atque conducibile Dei nomine significari; verum etiam omnium rerum creatorem sic appellari. Et verbo quidem omnes ita naturâ duce conveniunt, re autem creaturas pro creatore coluerunt.* Hæc Eusebius cæterum postmodum de cultu Deo debito loquemur. Nunc videndum amplius qualem esse crediderunt, quem omnes necessitate manifestæ veritatis adducti non agnoscere, aut certè non cognoscere non potuerunt.

Quam

Quam difficile veram de Deo Idęam formamus, qui nihil, ferè, nisi ad modum corporum concipimus, docet nos Augustinus lib. VII. Confes. cap. I. *Nec te cogitabam, Deus meus, in figurâ corporis humani*, inquit, *ex quo audire aliquid de Sapientiâ cœpi, semper hoc fugi, sed quod te aliud cogitatem, non occurrebat .... clamabat violenter cor meum adversus omnia phanthasmata mea, & hoc uno ictu conabar abigere circumvolantem turbam immunditiæ ab acie mentis meæ. Et vix dimota in ictu oculi ecce conglobata rursus aderat & irruebat in aspectum meum, & obnubilabat eum: ut quamvis non formam humani corporis, corporeum tamen aliquid cogitare cogeret per spacia locorum ... diffusum .... quoniam quidquid privabam spaciis talibus nihil mihi esse videbatur.*

Longâ tandem experientia doctus, modum optimum Deum cognoscendi tradit l. VIII. de Trin. c. II. hærere scilicet in prima cogitatione Divini cujuspiam Attributi, nec inquirere quale illud sit: *Ecce vide si potes*, inquit, *O anima prægravata corpore quod corrumpitur, & onusta terrenis cogitationibus multis & variis: Ecce vide si potes. Deus veritas est ... Noli quærere quid sit veritas, statim enim se opponent caligines imaginum corporalium, & nubila phantasmatum, & perturbabunt serenitatem, quæ primo ictu illuxit tibi cum diceres veritas. Ecce in ipso primo, quo velut coruscatione perstrinxit, cum dicitur, Veritas, mane si potes: Sed non potes: relaberis in ista solita, & terrena. Quo tandem pondere quaso relaberis, nisi sordium contractarum cupiditatis visco, & peregrinationis erroribus.* Deinde cap. III. *Ecce iterum, vide si potes, non amas certè, nisi bonum*: & infra. *Bonum hoc & bonum illud, tolle hoc, & illud, & vide ipsum bonum, si potes: ita Deum videbis, non alio bono bonum; sed bonum omnis boni.* Hæc S. Doctor.

Hujus Sancti modestiam reverentialem si fuissent imitati Philosophi Pagani, nunquam tam portentosas de Deo procudissent opiniones, nec evanuissent in cogitationibus suis, nec *dicentes se esse sapientes, stulti facti fuissent.* Adeo ut jure merito dixerit Chrysostomus, Christianos opifices, & rusticos plura, & solidiora, & Deo digniora sentire, quam sentiant ipsi Philosophi Pagani. Infinitum esset singulorum proferre sententias. Quare de præcipuis tantum pauca referam.

Epicurus,

Epicurus, qui quod omnium primus naturalem Dei in mentibus nostris Idæam observavit, laudem est meritus, vituperio dignus est, quod Deum sine humanâ figurâ non agnôrit, teste Cicerone l. 1. de Nat. Deor. Qui ulterius l. v. Tuscul. qq. ait, *Eum jocandi causâ Deos induxisse perlucidos, atque perflatiles. Stoici rotundam Deo formam dederunt.* Seneca epist xciv. Hi etiam, dum apud eundem Senecam epist. xlix. ajunt: *Philosophia mihi promittit, ut me parem Deo faciat.* Et hominem probro afficiunt, & Deum, dum de illo tam superbè, de hoc tam abjecte sentiunt, Idem Seneca l. 1. natur. qq. *Quid est Deus?* inquit, *quod vides totum, & quod non vides.* Sentiebant enim mundum hunc visibilem Deum esse, ut ait Origenes adversus Celsū (consensit aliquatenus Augustinus, qui l. 1, de Consensu Euang. c. xxiii. disertè Stoicos Deum corporeum statuisse affirmat) Platonici licet aliis melius de Deo & senserint, & scripserint, mundum etiam Deum esse dixerunt, sed Deum secundi ordinis, & inferioris subsellii. Tertullianus absolutè dicit Platonicos Deum corporeum agnovisse, Apologetici c. xlvii. & Theophilus Antioch. lib. iii. ad Autolycum, p. cxx. in fine idem ait. Sed & Cicero l. 1. de natura Deor. ait: *Plato in Timæo & in Legibus, dicit mundum Deum esse, & cælum, & Aram, & Terram, & animos, & eos, quos majorum instituto accepimus.* Putat Vossius l. 1. de Idololatriâ c. ii. falsum fuisse Ciceronem, & Platonem non ex propria sententiâ locutum, sed ex alienâ verbis citatis: ne scilicet Platonem agnosceret sibi fuisse contrarium, qui clarè dicit Deum esse ἀσώματον. Verum sine causâ sufficienti fidem Ciceroni detrahit. Facilior solutio videtur, quod Plato aliud de primo Deo dixerit, aliud de secundo. Aristoteles Philosophorum omnium accuratissimus Deum summo cælo trabalibus clavis affixit. l. viii. Physicorum, c. x, tex. lxxxiv. Pithagoras idem sensit, ut habet ejus vita apud Photium in Bibliothecâ, Cod. cclix. sive ccxlix. Aliis omnibus hoc saltem in re prudentior, imo & sapientior Simonides, Hieroni quid Deus esset interroganti, respondit, se quo magis id quæreret, eo minus invenire.

De divina Providentia, ejusque in mundum beneficentia adhuc pejùs senserunt, Plerique crediderunt, ut habetur in libro Job. c. xxii.

14. Deum

14 Deum *circa cardines cæli per ambulare, neque nostra considerare.* Ita Stoici apud Theophylum Antiochenum l. II. ad Autolicum p. LXXXII. Aristoteles ait Deum quidem movere primum mobile, eumque motum ad orbem usque Lunæ propagari: at sublunaria ejus potestati exemit: Imo & cognitioni: nam lib. II. magnorum Moralium c. XV. ait: *Quoniam bona cuncta obtinet Deus, quid faciet? neque enim dormiet. Contemplabitur inquiunt aliquid: id namque pulcherrimum, & maximè peculiare. Quid igitur contemplabitur? nam si quidquam aliud inspiciet, illud erit melius. Hoc vero absurdum, ut se quidquam melius habeat Deus. Ipse igitur se contemplabitur. At hoc delirum. Nam hominem, qui sese contemplatur, utpote sensu carentem increpamus.* Epicurus alia ratione æquè miserâ idem ostendere conatur, apud Ciceronem l. I. de Nat. Deorum. *Habemus*, ex πρόλεψι scilicet, *ut Deos Beatos, & immortales putemus. Qui enim nobis natura informationem Deorum ipsorum dedit, eadem insculpsit in mentibus, ut eos Æternos, & Beatos haberemus. Porrò quod æternum, beatumque est, id nec habere ipsum negotii quidquam, nec exhibere alteri. Itaque neque Irâ, neque Gratiâ teneri, quod quæ talia essent, imbecilla essent omnia.* Hæc ibi ne nimius sim, mitto aliorum somnia: nam nihil aliud quam somnia, & quidem ægri & deliri videntur, quæ de Deo, ejusque Providentia dixerunt magna illa ingenia. Unde discere possumus, quam necessarium nobis sit fidei lumen. Qui tamen plura videre volet, adeat Origenem l. III. contra Celsum, Cyrillum Alex. l. II. contra Julianum, Theodoretum lib. 5, de Curandis Græc. Affect. aliosque. Solus Epictetus, quantum ego scio, sapere videtur, ad sobrietatem & de Dei Providentiâ minus quam alii malè loqui.

Quid de Poetarum Gentilium (quos vates appellare solebant) fabulis dicam. De his Cicero: *Hi irâ inflammatos, & libidine furentes Deos induxerunt, feceruntque ut eorum bella, pugnas, prælia, vulnera videremus: odia prætera dissidia, discordias, ortus, interitus, querelas, lamentationes, effusas in omni intemperantiâ libidines, adulteria, vincula, cum humano concubitus, mortalesque ex immortali procreatos. Cum Poëtarum autem errore conjungere licet portenta Magorum, Ægyptiorumque in eodem genere dementiam: tum etiam vulgi opiniones, quæ in magnâ inconstantiâ Veritatis ignoratione*

 versantur.

versantur. Hactenus Cicero. Quid deportentosis & ridiculis fabulis de Diis Gentilium, quas merito Cicero *non Philosophorum judicia; sed delirantium somnia vocavit*. Quid demonstruosis Deorum suorum formis, qui si viverent, & suis cultoribus occurrerent eos percellerent, ut ajunt Patres. Adde ex Porphyrio lib. IV, de Abstinentiâ, §. IX. Belluæ; Elementa, mixta pro Diis habita.

Hinc Poëtæ Satyrici Ironia: Sat. XV.

O Sanctas gentes, quibus hæc nascuntur in hortis
Numina ———

Dicent Philosophi, hæc nihil ad se pertinere. Sed frustra dicent 1. quia varii Poëtæ fuerunt Philosophi, & quidem ex optimis. 2. quia Philosophi Poëtarum figmenta defenderunt, & in bonum aliquem sensum reducere conati sunt. Hinc Augustinus lib. X. de Civ. Dei c. III. ait: *Vel populorum Erroribus Auctores fuisse, vel illis resistere non ausos esse, verissimum est*. Nec enim periculo vacabat aliter sentire. Aristoteles relictis Athenis Chalcedonem aufugit, ut invidiam declinaret ob assertum Deum unum ortam: Socrates eandem ob causam ad bibendam cicutam ab Areopagitis damnatus est. Plato (ut habet Eusebius l. XI, de Præpar. Euang. c. IX) licet ad amicos & familiares scribens, Deum in singulari nominaret; communiter tamen Deos in plurali invocabat.

Quod si vera sit tua, mi Morlæe, Assertio, Philosophos Gentiles unum Deum agnovisse, & coluisse: Cur antiqui Patres adversus illos adeo operosè Dei unitatem asserere conati sunt? Quinam Paganorum deliria defendebant? Philosophi. Quos impugnarunt Christianæ Fidei Assertores? Philosophos. Quid probare sategerunt Patres adversus istos? unum solum esse Deum. Vide Justinum M: vide Athenagoram, vide Theophilum Antiochenum, Tertullianum, Cyprianum, Minutium felicem, Cyrillum, Arnobium, alios; invenies magnam operum adversus Gentiles Scriptorum partem in asserendâ eitatis unitate consumi. Cur hoc, si in eo dogmate concordes erant partes? cur pugnabant Patres, ubi nemo repugnabat, & tempus & operam perdebant, id probando, quod nemo negabat. Cur Animam Christianam esse

asseve-

asseveravit Tertullianus, quæ Deum unum fatebatur, si Philosophi Gentiles idem dicerent? Certè aut stulti Patres, qui quid esset Controversum ignorabant (quod nemo sanus dicet) aut falsus tu, quod mihi plusquam certum est.

Audiamus ulterius Patres: Origenes l. I. contra Celsum totam legum à Paganis contra Christianos latarum summam duo respicere docet, Ἀγάλματα, καὶ πολυθεοτήτιν, *Idola, & Politheismum.* Addit Prophetas Judæis datos, ne illa gens εἰς τὴν τῶν ἐθνῶν πολυθεότητα *in Gentilium Politheismum* incideret. Et lib. III, ait ipsos etiam Philosophos εἰς τὴν ἄθεον πολυθεότητα, ad Atheisticum Politheismum defecisse. Josephus Judæus l. IV. Antiq. c. IV. dicit Israelitas à Medianitis mulieribus ab uno ad plures Deos colendos fuisse traductos. Deinde Achior Ammonitarum Dux, Judith v. 8. de Judæis ait: *Deserentes ceremonias Patrum suorum, quæ in multitudine Deorum erant, unum Deum cæli coluerunt.* Inter Patres autem eorum erant præstantissimi Philosophi, à quibus *Abram* suam in Physicis scientiam hausit, quam Ægyptiis communicavit, & quæ per hos ad Græcos transiit.

Augustinus l. I. de cons. Euang. c. XXIII. & seq. ait, cum Philosophos potissimùm vero Platonicos, Politheismi puderet, eos dicere cæpisse, se unum Deum colere, quem alii Jovem Saturnum alii, aliis alii nominibus appellabant. Orosius l. VI. hist. c. I. ait Paganos jam unum Deum agnoscere: quasi antea non agnovissent Eusebius l. II. de Præpar. Euang. c. IX. ait Gentiles omnes cognoscere quidem unum Deum; sed multos colere, præter unum, haud admodum paucos. Consultum etiam Apollinis oraculum, quæ gens esset sapientissima? respondit:

Μόννοι χαλδαῖοι σοφίην λάχον: ὅι γὰρ Ἑβραῖοι
Αὐτογένητον ἄνακτα σεβασσόμενοι θεὸν αὐτόν.

Judæam gentem & Chaldæam vocans, à Patriâ unde orti, & Hebræam ab Heber. stirpis Auctore, ait Eusebius l. III. de Demonst. Euang. c. III. eamque cæteris præfert quod unum Deum colerent per se existentem. Hoc oraculum videri potest apud Cyrillum l. V. contra Julianum Justinum in Theodoret. l. I. de cur. Græc. Affect. & in Prole-

gomeno XII. Bibliis Poliglossis præfixo.

Vides, opinor, temerè à te dictum, quod *Philosophi Gentiles unum Deum summo, supremoque cultu venerati fuerint, aut colendum censuerint.* Commentum istud aut tuum, aut tuorum Symmistarum toti Antiquitati adversatur. Accedit Apostoli testimonium. Rom. I, 20. qui absolutè pronuntiat Philosophos *inexcusabiles, quòd cum Deum cognovissent, non sicut Deum glorificaverunt, neque gratias egerint; sed evanuerunt in cogitationibus suis & obscuratum est insipiens cor eorum. Dicentes enim se esse sapientes stulti facti sunt. Et mutaverunt gloriam incorruptibilis Dei, in similitudinem imaginis corruptibilis hominis, & volucrum, & quadrupedum, & serpentium ... Commutaverunt veritatem Dei in mendacium, & coluerunt & servierunt creaturæ potius quam creatori, qui est benedictus in sæcula. Amen.* Quæ Apostoli verba causæ tuæ jugulum hauriunt. Continent enim 1. Philosophos ex operibus mundi opificem cognovisse, 2. non tamen glorificasse, sive coluisse, neque Gratias egisse. 3. ex stultitiâ gloriam Dei in statuas mutasse, hoc est statuas pro Deo coluisse. 4. creaturam magis quam creatorem adorasse. Vide Chrysost. Hom. III. ad illum locum.

Superest ultima periodi tuæ pars. Deum Δημιουργὸν appellabant scilicet. Eam vocem ab iis usurpatam agnosco: rem voce significatam agnoscam, ubi ostenderis ex omnium Philosophorum sententiâ ὕλην. Sive materiam ipsam, atomosque à Deo productas esse. Hoc autem nunquam probabis, quamdiu extabunt Antiquorum & Philosophorum, & Historicorum opera, quæ alia omnia testantur Eusebius l. I. de Præpar. Euang. c. IV, ex Diodoro seculo viro apud Græcos clarissimo, hæc adfert ex Philosophis, & historicis: *Alii cum mundum ingenerabilem, & incorruptibilem putavissent; genus quoque hominum sempiternum esse asseruerunt: ita nunquam initium ipsorum fuisse arbitrati sunt. Alii generabilem & corruptibilem* (nempe mundum) *putarunt: homines quoque certis temporibus incæpisse affirmarunt.* Theophilus Antiochenus p. LXXXII. ait Platonem credidisse materiam ingenitam. Et pag. CXXXVI. ait Pythagoram idem de toto mundo dixisse. In re minimè dubiâ supervacaneæ diligentiæ esset plura testimonia congerere. Hinc & meo labori, & Lectoris tædio parco. Nunc & prædica doctis nihil utique credituris

cunctos

cunctos omnino Paganos Philosophos, mundum ab uno Deo conditum asseruisse: hunc Δημιούργον ab iis appellatum nos ut cum Prophetâ agnoscimus à Deo impressam animæ nostræ ipsius imaginem indelebilem, unde illum necessariò noverunt omnes; illam tamen adeo errorum nebulis obscuratam, & Phantasmatum ruderibus opertam, ut cum eodem Prophetâ dicere cogimur, *notus in Indæâ Deus*: quasi alibi altâ caligine, & fere in tenebris densis delitescens ignotus esset. Hinc Hieronymus: *Antequam illuminaret Crux, & antequam videretur Dominus in terrâ, scilicet in solâ Iudæâ notus Deus. Quando autem venit Salvator, in omnem terram exivit sonus eorum quasi diceret.* Per totam terram dispersum fidei lumen, Politheismi tenebras abegisset. *Gratias Deo super inenarrabili Dono ejus.* 11.Cor.x.15.

SECTIO XIV.

Varia Spirituum genera secundum Philosophos.

D. Morlæus p. 21. *Pagani inter illum unicum summum Deum, & homines, alios medios quosdam Divos, aut Deos minorum gentium esse credebant, quos communi nomine Daimonas specialius verò Penates, Lares & Deos particularium vel gentium, vel urbium, vel hominum Tutelares indigetabant. Horum autem Dæmonum alios dicebant nunquam corpori alligatos, (& hoc est illud genus genus, quod nos appellamus Angelos) Alios verè Heroum, hoc est præstantissimorum, & humano genere, dum viverent, optimè meritorum virorum animas à corpore separatas, quales apud nos sancti, & in Ecclesiâ Romanâ non sancti modo; sed etiam Gentili suo nomine Divi nuncupantur.*

Respondeo: condono tibi errorem vegrandem, quod putarint universim Pagani Philosophi Dæmones aliquos nunquam habuisse corpora: cum constet è contra plerosque sensisse nullos Dæmonas unquam esse sine corpore. Quem errorum (si talis sit) video etiam non paucis Patribus arrisisse qui cum Platone docuerunt omnes habere corpora. Enim verò, qui Deum ipsum summum corporeum asseverant, quæ fuit mens multorum Philosophorum, quomodo. An famulus

melior Domino? Creatura creatore perfectior? studium insanum affingendi Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Paganorum errores, in multos te, tuique similes, errores adduxit. Mitto etiam odiosam de nomine *Divus* annotationem; unde confirmas Ecclesiam Romanam planè Paganisare. Cum tamen Ecclesia nunquam in Missali, nec in Breviario, quantum memini, *Divos* nominet; sed aut *Sanctos*, aut *Beatos*, & Bellarminus in operum suorum recognitione mutari jusserit, si uspiam vocasset Sanctos *Divos*. Nec Ecclesia aut ipsi Jesuitæ intercesserunt executioni hujus mandati. Et tametsi non desint, qui *Divos* appellent, nec ob id condemnentur ab Ecclesia, hoc tamen potius est Conniventia, quam approbatio, multò minus ordinatio. Multos ipse novi qui nunquam voce *Divus*, aut *Divi* utuntur: pacificè tamen cum aliis eâ utentibus vivunt, quòd in bonum sensum accipi possit, & ab eâ utentibus ita sumatur. Vnde nec damnantur ab Ecclesiâ ob eam vocem. Quod si licuit Augustino Platonem *Divinum* nominare, quare non licebit aliquem verè Sanctum *Divum* appellare? Hæc de voce: Rem ipsam videamus.

Augustinus lib. IV. de Civit. Dei cap. XXVII. refert scævolam Pontificem Romanorum longè doctissimum, *tria Deorum genera distinxisse: primum à Poëtis traditum, secundum à Philosophis, tertium à Principibus Civitatis. Primum genus nugatorium esse dicit, quod de Diis multa Poëtæ iis indigna finxerint. Secundum, non congruere civitatibus, quod habeat aliqua superflua, aliqua etiam quæ populis obsit nosse: qualia sunt, non esse Deos, Castorem, Pollucem, Herculem, Æsculapum, &c. item verum Deum sexus non habere.* &c. Fuit ergo triplex Religio, *Poëtica*, *Philosophica*, *& Civilis*, Addit Augustinus tantum duplicem fuisse Religionem, quia *Poëtica* & *Civilis* una tantum erat. Mihi, similem ob causam, videtur tantum unicam fuisse: quia in Deorum templis, & eorum solemni cultu, *Philosophica* Civili (quæ eadem cum Poëtica erat) fasces submittebat, ut videbimus. Vnde sequitur non multum referre, quid de substantiis illis à corpore separatis disputarint in scholis Philosophi, aut in libris tradiderint Eruditi, tametsi id certò sciri posset; & idem omnes sensissent: quod verum non est. Nam

Iulianus

Iulianus ille cognomento Apostata apud S. Cyrillum Alex. lib. v. adversus illum, Spiritus illos Docuit esse veros Deos, Deo tamen summo inferiores, eique subditos, quibus Deus varias mundi partes regendas commisit. Iudæorum Deum unum ex illis esse, cæteris deteriorem ob Zelotypiam, Invidiam, Iram, Vindictæ cupiditatem, & crudelitatem. Ob quas in verum Deum blasphemias, etsi nihil fuisset aliud probrosum illud cognomentum illi adhærere debuisset. Basilides apud Tertullianum l. de Præscript. c. XLVI. non multum abludit, ait enim summum Deum vocari *Abraxan*, qui *mentem* creavit: à mente prodiisse *verbum*. A Verbo *Providentiam*, *virtutem*, *& sapientiam*. Inde *Principatus*, *Potestates*, & *Angelos* factos. Inter ultimos vero Angelos collocat *Iudæorum Deum*: quem verè Angelum fuisse asseverat, eique *sortitò obtigisse semen Abrahæ*.

Communior Philosophorum sententia tria spirituum genera distinguit: supremos Deos, infimos animas humanas, & medios Daimonas. Vide Augustinum l. VIII. de civit. Dei, ca. XIV. & l. IX. ejusdem operis c. VIII. Hanc spirituum in tres classes distributionem & Porphyrius lib. altero de Abstinentiâ §. XXXVII. & Augustinus Academiæ tribuunt, quasi à Platonis scholâ profecta esset: scilicet quod quod illam Platonici, præ aliis Philosophorum sectis, scriptis suis & celebrarint, & illustrarint, non quod illam primi excogitaverint. Nam Thales Platone longe antiquior apud Athenagoram Legat. pro Christianis tres eorum classes enumerat, Deum in earum primâ collocat, Dæmones in secundâ, Heroes in tertiâ! Quos Heroes ait animas esse corpore solutas; esseque bonas, si vitam bonam vixerint; sin verò, malos. Hesiodus apud Theodoretum l. VIII. de Cur. Græc. Affect. consentit, sed ait bonas aureorum hominum (id est, eorum, qui benè vixissent) animas in Daimonas converti & rerum humanarum curam suscipere. Iamblichus lib. de mysteriis Ægyptiorum ait *Dæmones*, & Heroes, Deos inter & hominum animas intercedere, atque de utroque extremo participare, in æqualiter tamen: Nam *Dæmones* ait propius ad Deos accedere: Heroes verò animabus humanis magis esse affines.

Apulejus

Apulejus lib. de Deo sacratis (de quo libro multa S. Augustinus l. VIII. de Civit. Dei. c.XIV.) Dæmones ipsos in quatuor classes distinguit, nimirum in *Lemures*, *Lares*, *Larvas*, & *Mannas*. Hæc sunt ejus verba: *Secundo signatu species Dæmonum, animus humanus exutus corpore, & liber, stipendiis vitæ corpore abjuratis. Hunc vetere latinâ linguâ reperio Lemurem dictitatum. Ex hisce Lemuribus, qui posteriorum suorum curam sortitus, pacato, & quieto numine domum possidet Lar dicitur familiaris. Qui vero propter adversa vitæ merita, nullis bonis sedibus, in certâ vagatione, ceu quodam exilio punitur, inane terriculamentum bonis hominibus, cæterum noxium malis, id genus plerique Larvas perhibent. Cum verò incertum est, quæ cuique eorum sortitio evenerit, utrum Lar sit: an Larva, nomine Manem Deum nuncupant & honoris gratiâ Dei additum est vocabulum.* Hæc Apulejus. Augustinus lib. IX. de Civitate Dei. c. XI. easdem Spirituum species, enumerat, cum eâ tamen differentiâ, quod *Lemures* & *Larvas* eosdem esse putet, scilicet Spiritus qui sciuntur esse mali. Cujus sententia mihi magis placet, quam Apuleii, dicentis *Lemures* latiùs patere, & esse quasi nomen genericum. *Lars Thusca* vox est, quæ πρύτανιν, sive Præsidem sonat. Unde Thuscis *Lars*, populi Præses dicitur, ut habetur apud Livium, & Ausonium. Vnde transfertur ad Spiritum significandum, qui domui cuipiam præficitur. *Manes* de se non male sonat; sed potius bonum aliquid significat, apud Servium l.III.Æneidos Virgilii. Hinc *Mane* optima diei pars: & privativum *Immane*, contrarium sensum retinet.

SECTIO XV.

Quæ spirituum mediantium in homines officia?

ALiqua fuisse secundum Philosophos, qui eos mediare docebant, dubitari non potest; sed & fide certum est; Cum Apostolus Hebr. 2. 14. pronunciet *omnis esse administratorios Spiritus in ministerium Missos propter eos, qui hæreditatem capient salutis.* Vnde Dei in homines benevolentia patet, qui non satis habuit spectabilem hunc mundum homi-

minis causâ creasse, ejusque pedibus substravisse & usui mancipasse; sed insuper ipsos Angelos, eo multò superiores naturâ, magis adhuc Gratiâ, & Gloriâ, ipsi ministrare jussisse. Quæ verò nobis ex eorum ministerio bona proveniant, hic investigamus. In istis rei abstrusissimæ obscuritate plus lucis adferent Platonicorum, quam omnium aliorum scripta: quod hi quam alii omnes Philosophi & plura, & meliora scripserint, addo & veriora, & sacris litteris magis conformia quæ Plato vidit, & ex iis non pauca desumpta in sua opera transtulit.

Primum Angelorum in homines officium est, iis commissos custodire. Censorinus: *Genius est Deus, cujus in tutelâ, ut quisque natus est, vivit.* Singulos singulis hominibus apponi docebant: hos credebant in dubiis monitores, in rectis hortatores in pravis reprehensores, omnium dictorum factorumque, & cogitatorum Conscios, & in ultimo judicio testes. Audiamus Apuleium: *ex hac sublimiori Dæmonum copiâ, Plato autumat,* inquit, *singulis hominibus in vitâ agendâ testes & custodes singulis additos, qui nemini conspicui semper adsint, omnium non modo actorum testes, verum etiam cogitatorum. Ac ubi vitâ editâ remeandum est, eundem illum, qui prædictus fuit, raptare illicò & trahere veluti custodiam tuam ad judicium, atque illic in causâ dicendâ assistere. Si qua commentiatur, redarguere, si qua vera dicat, asseverare: prorsus illius testimonio ferri sententiam.* Addit monitum salutare: *Proinde vos omnes, qui hanc Platonis divinam sententiam me interprete auscultatis, ita animos vestros ad quæcunque vel agenda, vel meditanda formate, ut sciatis nihil omnino præ istis custodibus, neque intra animam, neque foris esse secreti: quando ille omnia curiosè participes, omnia visat, omnia intelligat, & in ipsis penitissimis mentibus vice conscientiæ diversetur.* Ponit ex inde ob oculos Socratis exemplum: *Hic custos, singularis Præfectus, Domesticus speculator, individuus arbiter, inseparabilis testis, malorum improbator, bonorum probator, fixiitè animæ diversatur, sedulò cognoscatur, religiosè colatur, itaut à Socrate justitiâ & innocentiâ cultum sit, in rebus incertis prospector, dubiis præmonstrator, periculosis vitator, egenis opitulator: qui tibi quæat tum somniis, tum signis, tum etiam coram, cum usus postulat, mala avertuncare, bona prosperare.* Et paulò post: *Socrates vir apprimè perfectus hunc Deum suum cognovit, & coluit.* Hæc Apuleius.

Similia Deus revelavit. Psal. xc.10. *Non accedet ad te malum, & flagellum non appropinquabit tabernaculo tuo: quoniam Angelis suis mandavit de te, ut custodiant te in omnibus viis tuis. In manibus portabunt te, ne forte offendas ad lapidem pedem suum. Super Aspidem, & Basiliscum ambulabis, & conculcabis leonem, & draconem. Quoniam in me speravit, liberabo eum....* Quibus verbis Deus asseverat hominem nihil mali passurum, ob Angeli curam, cujus sub tutelâ vixit, Deo ita disponente: hunc Angelum, quasi esset Deus Averranceus, (si paganorum verbis uti liceat) mala avertere. Quo protegente, nec à Lapidibus in viâ, nec à bestiolarum latente veneno, nec ab apertâ belluarum violentiâ quicquam detrimenti capiamus. Hujus patrocinium experta Judith ait (libri sui c. XIII. 20.) *Vivit Dominus, quoniam custodivit me Angelus ejus & hinc euntem, & ibi commorantem, & inde huc revertentem: & non permisit me Dominus ancillam suam coinquinari.* Elias III. Regum XIX. 5. Sub Iunipero dormiens Angelum habuit & excitatorem, & obsonatorem. Pusillos habere *Angelos Beatos, qui in cælo faciem Patris vident*, testis est ipse Christus Dominus Matt. XVIII. 10. Et primi Christiani, dum puella nunciaret Petrum præ foribus stare, quem audierant illi in arctissimâ custodiâ detineri, nec sciebant ab Angelo fuisse liberatum: adeoque ne suspicari quidem poterant ipsummet esse, qui pulsaret fores, & admitti postularet dixerunt *Angelum Petri* esse. Actor. XII. 15. Vnde collige persuasum fuisse Christianis illius purissimi temporis quod quisque peculiarem sibi Angelum haberet, qui eorum dum viverent curam gereret. Neque vero morientes deserunt suos pupillos, nisi peccata eorum impediant; sed ad Refrigerii locum deducunt, & Beatorum sedes. Hinc *Lazarum* per Angelos ad Abrahæ sinum delatum testis est ipse Christus.

Patres huic veritati adstipulantur Origenes lib. VIII. Contra celsum: *A Dei benignitate, & Angelorum tutelâ servamur, ne quid à Dæmonibus patiamur.* Et in sequentibus plura habet visu digna eodem respicientia. Basilius in Psal. XXXIII. *Omni in Christum credenti Angelus assistit, nisi illum à nobis per actiones improbas profligaverimus.* Et in Psal. XLVIII. ἑκάστῳ τῶν πιστῶν ἐστὶν Ἄγγελος παρεζευγμένος, ἀξιος τῆς βλέψεως τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ

ἐν

ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. *Cuilibet fidelium est Angelus assistens, qui dignus est videre Patrem, qui in cælis est.* Hieronymus l. III. in Mat. c. XVIII. 10. *Magna dignitas animarum, ut unaquæque habeat ab arte nativitatis in custodiam sui Angelum delegatum.* Hilarius in Psal. CXXXIV. *Sunt Angeli parvulorum quotidie Deum videntes. Hi igitur spiritus ad salutem humani generis emissi sunt: neque enim infirmitas, nostra, nisi datis ad custodiam Angelis tot tantisque spiritualium cælestium nequitiis resisteret.* Vide Chrysost. Hom. III in epist. ad Hebræos & Bernardus in Psal. *Qui habitat. Angelis suis mandavit de te,* inquit, *Mira dignatio, & verè magna dilectio Charitatis. Quis enim? quibus? de quo? quid mandavit?* Et post multa: *Quoties ergo gravissima cernitur urgere tentatio, & tribulatio vehemens imminere, invoca custodem tuum, ductorem tuum adjutorem tuum in opportunitatibus, in tribulatione: inclama eum, & dic: Domine salva nos, perimus.*

Nec singularis cujuspiam tantum curam suscipiunt Angeli ad plures enim curandos quisque sufficit, ob excellentem cujusque virtutem: maxime qui sunt ex superioribus ordinibus. Josue, v. 14. *Princeps exercitus Domini,* qui Josue stricto gladio apparuit, Angelus videtur, toti populo Israëlitico Præfectus: & ille ipse videtur, qui Dan. XII. 1. dicitur *Michael Princeps Magnus, qui stat pro filiis populi* Danielis. Ejusdem Prophetiæ c. X. 20. mentio fit *Principis Persarum,* item *Principis Græcorum:* qui videntur Gentium illarum Angeli. Deinde illa vox apud Josephum l. VII. de Bello Judaico ex Templi aditis audita, *Migremus hinc,* ab Angelis emissa videtur, quibus à Deo demandata fuerat Templi custodia, qui migrandum sibi esse nuntiabant, ob populi scelera Dei vindictam celerem provocantia. Idem sensisse priscam Ecclesiam testis est Athenagoras, legat. Pro Christianis, pag. XI, & XXVII, & notatu dignum est, quod priori loco laudato professionem hujus Angelorum Tutelæ, sive Præfecturæ, professioni SS. Trinitatis subnectat, quasi crederent aut illius temporis Christiani, aut certè Athenagoras veritatem istam ad fidem spectare.

Nec illud omittendum, quod ex iisdem fontibus habemus, partibus dumtaxat mundi præfectos Angelos, non vero toti mundo. Athenagoras loco laudato asserit nulli uni Angelo totius mundi regimen

commissum. Hoc fortè desumpsit ex Job, XXXIV. 13. *Quem constituit alium super orbem, quem fabricatus est?* q. d. nullum. Et Apostolus Heb. II. 5. *Non enim Angelis subjecit Deus orbem terræ futurum*, & ejusdem epistolæ capite I. probat Christum Dominum eo etiam nomine Angelis præferendum, quod totius mundi præfecturam acceperat, cum aliis restricta esset Jurisdictio, ad angustos terminos, si illorum virtutem quodammodo infinitam, certè quâvis corporeâ majorem, æstimemus.

In hujus officii participium venisse juxta Platonicos antiquos, Animas separatas, mihi exploratum est. Tales enim erant Lares. Nobis ut id credamus satis est sacrarum Litterarum, auctoritas, & Ecclesiæ praxis. Tales erant sub veteri Lege toti Populo Israelitico *Abraham*, *Isaac*, & *Iacob*, aliique viri in generationibus suis magni. Post Jeroboami schisma, in decem Tribubus Elias, & Eliseus: In Judâ & Benjamin, Samuel, Hieremias, Daniel, & præ cæteris omnibus, *vir secundum cor Dei David*: ob cujus merita, & intercessionem, diu dilata fuit clades & sanctæ Civitati, & toti Regno imminens ut videre est sæpe in IV. Regum, & altero Paralipomenon libris. In novâ verò lege tales sunt Apostoli, primùm, deinde Martyres, tum alii Sancti, qui in quâque regione vixerunt, & mortui sunt, aut in quâ eorum corpora quiescunt, vel denique qui alicubi peculiari devotione coluntur.

Alterum dæmonum officium erat juxta Platonicos preces nostras Deo offerre: & impetrata nobis necessaria dona referre. Apuleius l. de Deo Socratis: *Sunt quædam divina media potestates*, inquit, *inter summum Æthera, & infimas terras, in isto intersitæ aëris spatio: per quas & desideria nostra & merita ad Deos commeant. Hos Græco nomine Δαίμονας nuncupant, inter mortales Cælicolasque vectores, hinc precum, inde donorum.* Quæ desumpta videntur ex Genes. CXXVIII. 12. *Vidit Iacob in somnis Scalam stantem super terram, & cacumen illius tangens cælum: Angelos quoque Dei ascendentes, & descendentes per eam.* Nec enim frustra fuit, aut exercitii tantum causâ institutus ille Angelorum motus ad Deum ascendentium, descendentium ad homines. Deinde preces hominum Deo per Angelos deferri, patet ex Apocal. V. 8. *Habebant viginti quatuor seniores*

niores Phialas aureas, plenas adoramentorum, quæ sunt orationes Sanctorum. Et Tobiæ XII, 12. *Quando orabas, ego obtuli orationes tuas* Domino.

Originem audiamus l. v. contra Celsum: *Fatemur*, inquit, *Angelos esse ministratorios quosdam spiritus, crebrò mittente Deo commeantes ad eos homines, quos manet salutis hæreditas: hosque modo ascendere ad purissima loca cælestia, & puriora adhuc super cælestia, oblaturos preces hominum: modo rursum descendere ad homines, reportando illinc aliud in usum singulorum, ut quisque dignus est beneficio.* Et Auctor lib. Meditationum apud Augustinum c. III. *Dicuntur Angeli*, inquit, *orationes, & vota nostra offerre Deo, non quia Deum doceant, qui omnia antequam fiant, sicut ac posteaquam facta sunt, novit; sed quia ejus voluntatem super his consulunt, & quod Deo jubente completum esse cognoverint, hoc nobis vel evidenter vel latenter reportant; unde hominibus ait, cum oratis, orationes vestras obtuli Deo. Similiter & nos cum oramus, non Deum docemus, quasi nesciat, quid velimus, & quo indigeamus; sed necesse habet rationalis creatura temporales causas ad æternam veritatem referre, sive petendo, quid erga se fiat, sive consulendo, quod fiat.* Ne potrò quis in certi Auctoris librū nihili faciat, sciant omnes similia prorsus in indubitatâ Augustini Epistolâ c. XX, ad Honoratum c. XXIX haberi. *Hoc non est sic accipiendum*, inquit, *tanquam nescienti aliquid annuntietur, ut sciat; sed sicut annuntiant Angeli non solum nobis beneficia Dei, verum etiam illi preces nostras. Nam scriptum est ubi Angelus hominibus dixit: Ego obtuli memoriam orationis vestræ, non ut Deus tunc noverit, quid velimus, vel quo indigeamus; novit enim Pater vester quid vobis necessarium sit priusquam petatis aliquid ab eo; sed quia necesse habet rationalis creatura obtemperans Deo, temporales causas ad æternam veritatem referre, sive petendo quid erga se fiat, sive consulendo quid faciat. Quippe mentis affectus est, ut ipsa construatur; non ut Deus instruatur.*

Bernardus idem Sentit. atque sumptâ inde occasione monet honorandos parvulos quosque: quia *Periculosè contemnitur ille*, inquit, *cujus preces ambitioso, Angelorum famulatu Deo exhibentur.*

Hoc etiam munus Animabus Beatis convenire sentit Ecclesia, dum eas invocat, oratque ut nostras preces suis adjunctis Deo gratiores reddant. Enimverò universim Christus pronuntiat eas pares Angelis futuras. Mat. XXII. 30. Unde dicendum quæ Angelis, eadem Beatis Animabus convenire.

Tertium Angelorum officium est, hominibus, ubi Deo placet hujus voluntatem notam facere: res ignotas, cum existentes, tum futuras indicare. Judic. VI, Gedeoni significavit Angelus eum populum suum liberaturum. Deum iratum alter eidem populo dixit Jud. II. Samsonem nasciturum Jud. XIII. Alibi Eliseo declaratum legimus quidquid Syriæ Rex in consilio suo contra Regem Israel moliretur, aut proponeret, Deo scilicet per Angelum revelante. Danieli prædicta generis humani redemptio post septuaginta annorum hebdomadas. Deinde in novo Testamento prænuntiata fuit Joannis Præcursoris nativitas ab Angelo Zachariæ, & Christi Domini Adventus Deiparæ. Lucæ I. Periculum huic nato imminens Mat. II. Incolumitas eorum, qui cum Paulo erant, Act. XXVII. Futurus Ecclesiæ status, in totâ Apocalypsi ab Angelo dilecto Christi discipulo revelatus est.

Hujus etiam officii participes sunt animæ ut patet ex II. Mach. XV. 12. & quatuor sequentibus. Videant alii, an id ex II. Paralip. XXI. 12. colligatur, ubi Elias dicitur litteris ad Joram Regem scriptis eum officii admonuisse. Vide quæ ex Eusebio l. VI. hist. c. V. retuli supra de S. Potamienâ Basilidi puritatis ejus vindici Martyrium futurum revelante.

Dæmones hoc officium usurparunt, ex institutis variis in locis Oraculis. Quale in sacris Litteris (IV Reg. I.) Beelzebub in Accaron. Inter Gentiles nominatissima Apollinis Pythii, inter Græcos, Jovis Ammonii apud Ægyptios, Dodonæum, cui præerant columbæ, Dodonides, ut ait Pausanias in Arcadicis, hoc est, fæminæ vaticinatrices: Trophonii, & alia.

Quartum denique officium est insolita, & mira facere: ubi Deus aut permittit, aut imperat. Danielis III. 49. 50. Angelus ignis violentiam iræ discussit, ut media fornax esset *quasi ventus roris flans*. Ab Angelo occisa unâ nocte de exercitu Sennacherib centum octoginta quinque millia refert Isaias c. XXXVII. 36. Hoc aliquando visibiles operantur, ut Danielis III. sæpe in observati. Sic cùm Augustinus circumcessionum insidias sui Ducis errore vitavit, ut tradit Possidius in ejus vita c. XII, & ejusdem operis c. XV. refertur alius error, cum S. Augustinus

Sermo-

Sermonem faciens in Ecclesiâ præter ejus intentionem dilapsa est ejus oratio: Ea enim non casu contigisse; sed Dei providentiâ, & Angelorum ministerio, crediderunt & qui interfuerunt, & ego. Similiter quod Templi Hierosolymitani æneæ valuæ, quas multi homines unitis viribus ægrè amoliri consueverant, suâ sponte paterent, sine ope humanâ, ut habet Josephus, Angelo cuipiam adscribo.

Simili virtute facta legimus aliqua inter Gentiles opera, quæ miracula videbantur. v.c. delatam in cribro à Tibri, ad Capitolium aquam, triremem adverso flumine eodem à virgine Vestali ductam: statuas locutas, exta sine capite inventa, iisdemque restitutam sanitatem, & id genus alia passim apud Lucium obvia.

Duo hæc officia simul junxit, & paucis exposuit sæpè nominatus Apuleius: *Per hos eosdem* (dæmones) *ut Plato in Symposio autumat, cuncta denuntiata, & Magorum varia miracula, omnesque præsagiorum species reguntur.*

Difficultas hic occurrit, quorum Angelorum ministerio Deus utitur, ad istiusmodi effectus producendos? Cum enim & malorum, æquè ac bonorum Dominus sit, & pleno in utrosque Dominio fruatur, tam malis (licet fortè invitis) quam bonis ubique volentibus, & ad nutum promptissimis uti potest. Malum fuisse liquet, qui Jobi patientiam exercuit: quia Job I. vocatur *Satan.* Item qui Ægyptum sub Pharaone populati sunt: quia Psal LXXVII. 49. mala Ægyptiis inflicta dicuntur *Immissiones per Angelos malos.* Incertum mihi, qualis fuerit, qui evaginato Gladio Davidi apparuit 1. Paral. XXI. 16. & Pestilentiam sparserat. Videtur bonus fuisse, qui per Gad prophetam Regi indicavit, qua ratione Deo placato per Sacrificium malo finem imponi posset.

Mihi probabile videtur (quod sensit Origenes l. 16. VIII. contra Celsum) per solos bonos Angelos bona præstari: mala verò per malos, qui ad ea procuranda toto malignæ naturæ suæ impetu feruntur: nec Dei ad id imperio opus, sola permissio sufficit (ut ex initio libri Job patet) quæ si adesset, & dæmonibus malis pro libitu in homines grassari liceret, nec illi veluti rabidi canes catenâ vincirentur, nec nos

& Dei Protectione, & Angelorum bonorum præsidio muniti essemus, totum mundi spectabilis ordinem inverterent, & humanum genus funditus delerent.

Hactenus quæ dixisti, Doctissime Morlæe, pro virili tueri, atque probare conatus sui, paratus in aliis idem facere; quando salvâ veritate licet. Hinc æstimare te velim, quam æquo in te, tuaque scripta sim animo, qui velim si liceat ea asserere: æquiori feres, quæ deinceps adversus te dicturus sum (quæ stante veritate stare non possunt) quandoquidem illa non tibi contradicendi studio, non tibi repugnandi desiderio; sed solæ veritatis amore dicentur.

Ea porro jubet ne dissimulem non benè à te Gentilibus universim adscribi eam dæmonum in tres classes distributionem: quæ non omnium erat. A Platonis scholâ profectam esse tradit Porphyrius l. II. de Abstinentiâ §. XXXVII. A Pythagoræorum, Epicureorum, & Peripateticorum scholis exulasse constat: & in Civili Theologiâ locum nullum habuisse & evidens est, & infra ostendetur.

Petit cur Deo visum Angelorum operam adhibere ad hominum salutem procurandam, aut rerum sive sublunarium, sive superlunarium administrationem, ad quæ solus sufficit? Respondeo inverecundam esse quæstionem, cui sufficienter respondetur dicendo, Deum id voluisse. Potest Deus ut omnia creavit, uno verbo (*Dixit & facta sunt*) ita cuncta solo nutu regere: ad hoc tamen hominum ope utitur. Rom. XIII. 1. Saulum ipse ad fidem perduxit, Act. IX. potest & alios ita convertere, Angelo tamen usus est ad Centurionem vocandum. Act. X. Apostolis ad alios Rom. X. Potest vocatos per se regenerare: aquam tamen adhiberi jubet. Et sicut solus omnia primo die fecit, ita & ultimo facere potest: tamen utetur ad citandos ad Judicium homines Archangelo ut præcone 1. Thessal. IV. 16. Angelis ut Lictoribus ad cogendos ad Tribunal undique electos, Mat. XXIV. 31. & Segregandos ex horum consortio malos, hosque in caminum ignis mittendos, Mat. XIII. 49, 50, ubi lata est sententia irrevocabilis.

Hæc (quæ de spiritibus mediantibus diximus) si dixeris nos ab Ethnicis hausisse, falsi tibi dicam impingam: nec nos ab Ethnicis, sed

&

& illi, & nos à sacris Litteris, & à Spiritu sancto accepimus. Quod si quæ vera Gentiles habuerunt, non ideo illud nos abjicere debemus. Sicut unius Dei cultum non abjicimus, quia Turcæ juxta nobiscum unum agnoscunt.

SECTIO XVI.

Deos Paganorum fuisse homines.

D. Morlæus: p. 21. *Hos ex utroque genere* Δαίμονας *dicebant Ethnici esse, ut naturâ medios, ita officio mediatores inter summum Deum, & homines, quibus scilicet mediantibus & procurantibus homines Deum iratum placabant, & à Deo placato omnia quæ ipsis ad felicitatem necessaria erant, impetrabant. Et eo nomine hos* Δαίμονας *non quidem ut summum Deum; sed tanquam humani generis apud summum Deum procuratores, patronos, & advocatos ab hominibus colendos esse censebant.*

Respond. pergis Ethnicis universis tribuere, quæ uni sectæ peculiaria erant. Et quod deterius est, Philosophicam, Theologiam cum civili malè confundis, quæ Varro & Scævola rectè, distinxerunt: & Philosophicam in Templis obtinuisse contendis (quibus penitus exulabat, solâ Poëticâ illic omnia disponente) ut obtineas cultum ab Ethnicis supremum Deum, veluti bonorum omnium largitorem munificentissimum: Dęmones verò tantum ut illius amicos, pro nobis intercessores, nostros apud illum *Procuratores*, *Advocatos*, & *Patronos*. Ut sic Paralelum, quod instituis Paganismum inter, & Papismum, melius constaret. Addere parijure, hoc est, nullo, potuisses Paganos cultu *Latreiæ* unum Deum verum adorasse; reliquos vero *Doulęiæ*; quo magis lectoribus minus pericis imponeres. Enimverò, qui dogmata finxisti priscis ignota, cur ab imponendis vocibus abstines? ubi *semel verecundiæ* & veritatis *limites transierit*, *oportet gnaviter* . . . . . pergere. Quæ hic dicis, nimis magnum continere postulatum: quale nec te decet gratis petere, nec nobis adest libet, aut licet gratis largiri; obstantibus Antiquorum cum gentilium, tum Christianorum, quæcumque extant monumentis.

Hæc enim evidenter probant, non Romulum tantum aut Cæsarem, Antinoum, aut Æsculapium, Herculem, aut Castorem atque Pollucem; sed etiam ipsum Jovem Optimum Maximum, ut Romani loquebantur (qui à Poëta dictus est *Deum Pater atque hominum Rex.* Et alibi: *Iovis omnia plena*) & etiam Jovis Patrem

(*Qui primus ab Æthecio venit Saturnus Olympo*
Arma Iovis fugiens, & regnis exul ademptis.
Qui genus indocile, ac dispersum Montibus albis
Composuit legesque, dedit, Latiumque vocari
(Maluit, his quoniam latuisset tutus in oris.)

Et eum qui hunc exulem hospitio excepit Janus Italiæ Rex (quem Satyricus Poëta Satyrâ VI. v. 393. *Divûm Antiquissimum* appellat) hos inquam omnes, qui Majorum Gentium Dii fuerunt, homines fuisse. Adeoque tota Paganica Religio quanta erat, circa animas à corpore solutas occupata fuit, vel circa malos dæmones, qui hominum nomen assumpserant.

Hoc prob. 1. ex Patribus id diserte asserentibus. Augustinus l. VIII de Civ. Dei c. XXVI. hoc lemma proponit: *Quod omnis Religio Paganorum circa homines mortuos fuerit impleta.* Hieronymus l. I. comment. in Oseæ c. II. *Omnia Idola ex mortuorum errore creverunt.* Et l. III. Com. in Matth. ad verba: *Tu es Christus filius Dei vivi*, ait: *Deum vivum appellat, ad distinctionem eorum Deorum, qui putantur Dii, sed sunt mortui.* Chrysostomus Hom. I. ad Pop. Antioch. *Tota multitudo Deorum Gentilium, ex ejusmodi hominibus conflata est.* Minutius Felix: *Majores nostri dum Reges suos colunt religiosè, dum defunctos illos in imaginibus videre volunt, dum gestiunt eorum memoriæ in statuis detinere, sacra facta sunt, quæ fuerant assumpta solatia. Lege stoicorum scripta, vel scripta sapientum, eadem mecum recognoscis, ob merita virtutis, aut muneris Deos habitos.* Et infra: *Manifestum est, homines illos fuisse, quos & natos legimus, & mortuos scimus.* Et Cyprianus. l. de Idolorum vanitate: *Deos, non esse, quos colit vulgus, hinc notum est*, inquit, *Reges enim fuerunt, qui ob regalem memoriam, coli apud suos etiam in morte cæperunt.* Plura Patrum testimonia dabimus infra.

Prob. 2. ex Tertulliano, qui quæ Paganorum erant ignorare non potuit,

potuit, quia cum iis vixit, & fortè initio fuerat ex ipsis. Is Apolog. c. x. ait: *Deos vestros colere desinimus, ex quo illos non esse cognovimus. Sed nobis, inquitis, Dii sunt. Appellamus & provocamus à vobis ad conscientiam vestram, illa nos judicet, illa nos damnet, si poterit negare omnes istos Deos vestros homines fuisse. Sed & ipsa, si inficias ierit, de suis Antiquitatum monumentis revincetur, de quibus vos didicit testimonium perhibentibus ad hodiernum, & civitatibus in quibus nati sunt, & regionibus, in quibus aliquid operati vestigia reliquerunt, in quibus etiam sepulti demonstrantur. Nec ego per singulos decurram, proprios, communes, masculos, fœminas, rusticos, urbanos, nauticos, militares (otiosum est etiam titulos persequi) ut colligam in compendium, & hoc non quo cognoscatis; sed recognoscatis, certè enim oblitos agitis. Ante Saturnum Deum penes vos nemo est: ab illo census totius vel potioris, vel notioris Divinitatis. Itaque quod de Origine constiterit, id de posteritate conveniet. Saturnum itaque quantum littera docent, neque Diodorus Græcus, aut Thallus, neque Cassius, Severus, aut Cornelius Nepos, neque ullus Commentator ejusmodi Antiquitatum, aliud quam hominem fuisse tradunt. Si quærat rerum argumenta, nusquam invenio fideliora, quam ipsam Italiam, in quâ Saturnus post multas expeditiones, post Attica hospitia consedit, exceptus à Jano. Mons, quem incoluerat, Saturnius dictus: civitas quam depopulaverat Saturnia usque nunc est.* Et l. 1. contra Marcionem, c. xi. *Error orbis Deos præsumpsit, quos homines interdum confitetur: quoniam ab unoquoque prospectum videtur, utilitatibus, & commodis vitæ.*

Arnobius & ipse quondam Paganus: l. 11. Contra Gentiles: *Vos hominem nullum colitis? non unum, aut alium? non innumeros alios? quinimo non omnes, quos in templis habetis vestris, mortalium sustulistis ex numero, & cælo, sideribusque donastis? si enim fortè vos fugit sortis vos fuisse humanæ & communis conditionis, replicate Antiquissimas litteras, & eorum scripta percurrite, quæ vetustatis vicini, sine ullis Attestationibus cancellâ veritate in liquidâ produxerunt. Iam profectò discetis quibus singuli Parentibus, quibus Matribus fuerint procreati, quâ in nati regione, quâ gente, quæ fecerint, egerint, pertulerint.*

Prob. 3. ex Ætate quâ vixerunt. Tertullianus Apolo. c. iv. *Posteriores illos Deos illâ ætate, confitentur ipsæ urbes, in quibus nati, & mortui sunt.* Et lib. de Anima c. xxiv. *Multo antiquior Moyses etiam Saturno,*

nongentis circiter annis. Idem affirmat etiam Theophilus Antiochenus l. III. ad Autolycum. Eusebius præfatione in Chronicon licet non tantum tempus effluxisse sentiat Moysen inter, & Saturnum, hunc tamen illo longe posteriorem tempore affirmat. *Moses iis, quos Græci antiquissimos putant, senior deprehenditur, Trojano bello, ac multo superior Hercule, Musæo, Lino & cæteris Diis gentium, sacrisque vel Vatibus. Ipsius quoque Jovis gestis, quem Græciâ in arce Divinitatis collocavit. Hos inquam omnes, quos commemoravimus, etiam post Cecropem Diphyem, quem primum Attica Regem esse convincimus. Cecropem autem præsens historia Mosi coætaneum ostendit.* Et infra c. *Sine ullâ ambiguitate Moses, & Cecrops, qui primus Atheniensium Rex fuit, iisdem fortè temporibus.*

Occurrit hic difficultas non contemnenda: narrat Eusebius ibidem Cecropis ætate natam in arce olivam, referit, & *Minerva, Jovis filiæ,* nomen Civitati *Regia impositam* & Cecropem invocasse *Jovem* hoc est adorasse, aut coluisse. Quæ vix intelligi possunt, si nec *Minerva* nec ejus Parens *Jupiter* Cecropis ætate natus erat. Dicendum videtur non de eodem Jove locutum Eusebium; sed de diversis, quarum unus Cecrope Antiquior sub nomine *Ammon* in Ægypto, Cecropis patriâ, colebatur, eratque *Cham*, secundus Noë filius. Alter *Jupiter* Saturni & opis filius Cretæ Rex, quem *Græcia in arce Divinitatis collocavit.* Cecropem autem credo patriâ superstitione coluisse priorem, non verò alterum, qui necdum natus fuit, quando denatus fuit Cecrops. Hic enim, ut idem habet Eusebius, CCCLXXV. annis Trojanum bellum præcessit. A Jano verò Italiæ Rege, sub quo Saturnus regno pulsus illuc confugit, ad Æneæ adventum, numerat, idem CL annos: quos si demas CCCLXXV illis; supersunt CCXXV anni, inter Cecropem Athenarum Regem primum, & Jovem Cretæ Tyrannum, qui fugato Patre Regnum invasit: qui fuit magnus ille *Jupiter, Optimus Maximus, Deum Pater, atque Hominum Rex.* Quem Græcia primùm, deinde cuncti Idololatræ divinis honoribus coluerunt.

Neque novum cuiquam videri debet, quod multos asseram fuisse Joves: id enim nemini novum erit, nisi cui omnia antiqua sunt nova. Arnobius *varios* fuisse asserit; Theophilus Antiochenus, *multos.*

Vossius

Vossius sex refert. Varro apud Tertullianum Apolog. c. XIV. usque ad trecentos numerasse dicitur. Nec multum à vero abludit: quia *fabulosa vetustas*, ait Vossius, *eo nomine dignata est Reges, ac Principes, qui sui Ordinis cæteros potentiâ antistarent. Itaque videas nullo prope sæculo defuisse suum Iovem* (mallem Joves dixisset: Joves enim singulis sæculis multi fuerunt, & multæ Junones) *usque ad tempora belli Trojani. Tot Heroum, qui Ioves dici meruerunt, ex Nationum saltem opinione, bona, mala, vera, ficta, uni Iovi Cretensi tribuerunt Poëta, etiam furta venerea, & raptus.* Hæc Vossius. Hic porro Cretensis Cecrope posterior à Græcis *in Divinitatis arce colloeatus est*, ut ait Eusebius constant ergo, quæ in Eusebio adversâ fronte pugnare videntur.

Obiter observo non defuisse, qui *Noachum Saturni* nomine cultum arbitrati sunt. Et conveniunt tres filii *Sem*, *Cham*, & *Iaphet*. *Iaphet à cujus posteris divisæ sunt Insulæ gentium*, *in regionibus suis*, ait sacer historicus Gen. x. 5. *Neptunum* appellare, & ei in mare dederunt imperium. *Sem Pluto* dictus divitiarum Deus, quia rerum in Asiâ ditissimâ regione potitus est. *Cham* verò ipse est Ægyptiorum *Ammun*, & *Iupiter Ammon* dictus est. Quem Ægyptii duobus ejus fratribus prætulerunt, in honorem gentis suæ ab ipso descendentis, licet naturâ esset *Semo*, & inferior ætate, & donis minor, & ex Patris maledictione, etiam infra *Iaphet*. *Chanaan* Chami maledicti filius, *Mercurius* est: hic ex avi maledictione servus aliorum futurus dicitur; & Mercurium Poëtæ in servilibus plerumque ministeriis occupatum referunt. Litteris præesse dicitur, quia à Phænicibus ejus posteris litteras didicere Græci. Mercatorum Deus dictus, quia regio, quam ejus posteri occuparunt commercio florebat: & quia iidem subinde Piraticam exercebant, dictus est Mercurius furari, & furum præses. Denique alata talaria tribuerunt, quia Phænicum naves velis velut alis erant admotum instructæ celerrimum. Redeo ad rem, si hæc sint extra illam.

Prob. 4. ex diversitate sexuum. Hanc urget Arnobius l. III. contra Gentiles, ferè toto, inde probat veros fuisse homines, quos Pagani colebant; non verò spiritus, multò minus perfectissimos spiritus. Qualis Deus est. *Adduci*, inquit, *primum hoc ut credamus, non possumus,*

immortalem præstantissimamque naturam divisam esse per sexus. Doluit Scævola supra citatus, mentionem factam de sexibus Deorum. Cicero vero adeo sibi displicuisse testatus est Deos per sexus distingui, ut eam ob rem Pagani ejus opera Senatus consulto comburi voluerint, *quod iis Christiana religio comprobaretur, Vetustatis verò opprimeretur auctoritas.* Quasi Paganismus quem Vetustatem appellant, sine istâ sexuum diversitate stare non posset.

Hinc sequitur 5. Probatio: Deos Paganorum verè genitos fuisse: ad quid enim alioqui destinaretur illa in Diis sexuum diversitas? Ovidius sine ambagibus id agnovit, de venere, de quâ hæc canit:

Illa Deos omnes, longum est numerare creavit. Athenagoras leg. pro Christi p. XVII. *Dii non fuerunt ab æterno; sed ita eorum quisque natus est, ut nos etiam nascimur.* Theophilus Antiochenus l. II. ad Autolycum: *Hoc quidem vobis, quod necessarium est accedit,* inquit, *qui Historias, & Genealogias eorum legitis, qui Dii dicuntur. Dum genealogias eorum contexitis in hominum numerum eos ponitis. Hos postmodum Deos appellatis: & tanta vestra Socordia est, ut neque cogitare, neque intelligere velitis, eos tales esse, quales natos, sive genitos legitis, videlicet homines.* Deinde quærit, quare jam generare desierint Dii? An præ senectute eorum effæta sint corpora, ut amplius gignere non possint? quomodo ergo constabit illis æternitas? Confirmatur hoc argumentum ex eorum patria, sive locis in quibus nati sunt: Jupiter in Insulâ Cretâ, Mars in Thraciâ, Juno in Samo, vel Argo &c.

Prob. 6. ex eo quod mortui sint, eorumque sepulchra olim extarent. S. Cyprianus l. de Idolorum Vanit. *Antrum Iovis in Cretâ visitur, & sepulchrum ejus ostenditur, & ab eo Saturnum fugatum manifestum est.* Lactantius Firmianus l. I, Div. Instit. c. XI. ait hoc Epitaphium Jovis sepulchro insculptum: Ὁ Ζεὺς τοῦ Χρόνου, *Iupiter Saturni*, nempe filius. Porphyrius l. de vitâ Pythagoræ, ait, hunc Jovis tumulo addidisse:

Zan jacet hoc tumulo, qui vulgò Iupiter audit.

Refert etiam eundem Pythagoram Elegias conscripsisse, Apollinis sepulchro adjiciendas, quæ cujus esset filius indicabant. Cum tamen Gentiles ægrè agnoscerent Jovem illum, qui *Deum Pater atque hominum*

Rex

Rex vocabatur, mortuum esse, negarentque uspiam extare ejus sepulchrum, Cyrillus lib.x. contra Jul. pag.cccxlii. Cretenses affirmat ejus sepulchrum ostendere, Pythagoram illud invisisse, idque negari non posse.

Prob. 7. ex solemnibus ceremoniis, & ritibus, quibus illi Dii colebantur: quo eorum vitam, & mortem repræsentabant. Varro apud Augustinum l. 1. de Cons. Euangel. c.xxiii ait: *Deorum sacra ex cujusque eorum vitâ, vel morte, quâ inter homines vixerunt vel obierunt fuisse composita.* In iis varia summæ mæstitiæ signa edebant eorum Sacerdotes, teste Baruch c. vi. 30. 31. *In domibus eorum* (nempe Deorum, hoc est in Templis) *Sacerdotes sedent, habentes tunicas scissas, & barbam rasam, quorum capita nuda sunt. Rugiunt autem clamantes contra Deos suos, sicut in cenâ mortui.* Hinc fortè factum, ut ex istis aliqua Sacerdotibus Israeliticis inhiberentur, aliqua toti populo illi. Vide Lev.x.6. & Deut. xiv. 1. De istis ritibus Athenagoras Leg. pro Christ. p.xiv. *Ægyptiorum ceremonias, quis non ridiculas dixerit?* inquit, *Plangunt illi per festos, solemnesque conventus & pectora feriunt, tamquam propter defunctos, & rursus Sacrificant tamquam Diis.* Pupugit præposterum hunc dolorem Xenophanes Colophonius, dum ait: Εἰ θεοὺς νομίσει, μὴ θρηνεῖν· εἰ δὲ θρηνοῦσι, μὴ θεοὺς νομίζειν. *Si Deos crediti, nolite eos lugere: si lugendi sint, nolite eos adorare.* ex tali in sacris planctu colligit Poëta Osyrin hominem fuisse:

Et quem tu plangens hominem testaris Osyrin.

Simili ratione probamus cum Augustino, minutio Felice, aliisque cunctos Gentilium Deos homines fuisse.

Hæc de solemnibus, & honestioribus eorum sacris. Alia erant mysteria, quæ cum solis initiatis communicabantur, nec possunt salvo pudore referri. Ideoque de iis ego nihil. De quibus agunt Euseb. l. altero de præpar. Euang. cap. v. Arnobius l.v. contra Gentiles, & alii. Hæc autem non tantum homines eos fuisse demonstrant, sed etiam pessimos & turpissimos homines.

Prob. 8. ducitur à testimoniis & Confessionibus ipsorum Gentilium. Cicero eorum omnium clarissimus, & notissimus, l.ii. de Nat. Deorum: *Videtisne,* inquit, *ut à physicis rebus benè & utiliter inventis, ratio*

sit

sit tracta, ad commentitios, & fictos Deos. Clarius adhuc Tusculanarum qq. I. *Si scrutari vetera*, inquit, *& ex iis, quæ scriptores Græciæ tradiderunt erutre conor, ipsi illi majorum Gentium Dii, qui habentur, hinc à nobis profecti in cælum reperientur. Quære quorum demonstrentur sepulchra in Græcia: reminiscere, quoniam es initiatus, quæ tradantur mysteriis: tum denique quam latè hoc pateat intelleges.* Et de Romulo: *Qui hanc urbem condidit, Romulum, ad Deos immortales benevolentiâ famæ sustulimus.* Hæc citat Augustinus l. I de cons. Euang. c. XXIII. Huic addam Gentium scriptorum facile antiquissimum, *Sanconiathon.* Ex quo Beatus Cyrillus l. VI. cont. Jul. p. CCV. hæc verba citat: Οἱ παλαιότατοι τῶν ἑλλήνων, ἐξαιρέτως ὑ Φοίνικες τε καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι, παρ᾽ ὧν οἱ λοιποὶ παρέλαβον ἄνθρωποι, θεοὺς ἐνόμιζον μεγίστους, τοὺς τὴν βιοτικὴν χρείαν εὑρόντας, ὑ κατὰ τὸ εὐπορήσαντας τὰ ἔθνη. *Vetustissimi Græcorum, sed maximè Phænices & Ægyptii, à quibus reliqui quasi per manus acceperunt,* Deos Maximos *arbitrati sunt, qui res vitæ utiles invenissent, aut benè de gentibus aliquo modo meriti fuissent.* Notentur illa verba: *Maximos Deos.* Nec enim *Heroes*, aut *Dæmones* sive Dii minorum Gentium aut inter summum Deum & homines, mediatores, tantum habiti fuerunt, qui de Gentibus benè meriti fuissent (quod ait D. Morlæus) sed maximi Dii, Dii majorum gentium, Dii ipsi primi, *Iupiter, Apollo, &c.*

Aristophanes in Avibus, ait & has, & animalia Diis omnibus antiquiora esse.

Diodorus siculus fuse probat Græcos omnes suos ab Ægyptiis Deos accepisse, eosque veros fuisse homines.

Alexander Magnus peculiari libro ad matrem suam misso refert, se ab Ægyptio quodam Sacerdote minis adhibitis didicisse, quod omnes Dii, quos eo tempore Pagani colebant, homines fuissent. Hujus libri ab Alexandro missi testes habemus Athenagoram leg. pro Christi. p. XXXI. Cypr. I. de Idol. vanitate & Augustinus l. VIII. de Civ. Dei c. XXVII. & l. I. de consensu Euangel. c. XXIII. qui addit Sacerdoti nomen fuisse *Leonta.*

Tacitus l. XV. Annalium in fine: *Deûm honor Principi non ante habetur, quam agere inter homines desierit.* Unde constat Deum habitum ubi mortuus esset. Hoc forte Romæ fuit observatum, ut non nisi post fata cole-

colerentur divinis honoribus: non tamen ubique id obtinuit, aut saltem non semper. Constat enim *Nabuchodonosor* superstitem, statuam suam & confici curasse, & erigi, & adorari. Dan. III. De quo Sulpitius Severus l. II. historiæ: *Nabuchodonosor elatus rebus secundis, statuam sibi auream immensæ magnitudinis posuit, adorarique eam, ut sacram effigiem præcepit.* Tametsi enim hæ defunctis solis ut plurimùm statuerentur, tamen Ambitione & pravorum Adulatione, corrupta hominum ingenia, ut idem vivis fieret effecerunt. Quod ait Isidorus Pelusiota l. II. Epist. CLXXVII. ad Theodotum Præsbyterum. Et quid est quod non cadat in hominis Animum superbiâ tumidum Adulantium laudibus corruptum, cum ut ait Juvenalis Satyrâ IV.

Nihil est, quod credere de se
Non possit, cum laudatur, Diis æqua potestas,

De omnibus indiscriminatim Gentilibus hactenus locuti fuimus: eosque ostendimus homines, pro Diis coluisse. Superest aliquid dicamus de Philosophis, de quibus peculiaris est difficultas, quòd ignorare non possent falsa esse, quæ de hominibus in Deos translatis vulgabantur in plebe, cantabantur in Theatris, colebantur in Templis: Hæc ipsi cum plausu ridebant in suis classibus. Verum non impune risissent in Templis, quod ex Socratis fato apparet. Fateor itaque eos Deum verum cognovisse, non tamen ut Deum coluisse, atque *glorificasse, neque gratias egisse; sed evanuisse in suis cogitationibus, & stultos factos esse.* Quod ex Apostolo didici. Constat Socratem licet ob unius Dei assertionem morti fuisset adjudicatus jam jam animam efflantem Gallum Æsculapio vovisse. Tantam apud illum vim habuit inolitus error, pravâ consuetudine diuturnâ confirmatus.

Romani lege latâ Poëtarum quidlibet de Diis commentantium licentiam coërcere conati sunt. Sed frustrà: nam plus valuit, ad eam retinendam superstitio inveterata, ab ipsis, quos colebant Diis fota, quam ullæ leges ad eam coercendam, obstantibus tum malorum hominum studiis, tum pessimorum dæmonum artibus, maximam in iis fabulis ad corrumpendos mores (quod unicè optant) vim inesse probè scientium quia ut ait Augustinus l. II. de Civ. Dei c. VII. *Omnes*

cultores talium Deorum magis inventur, quid Iupiter fecerit, quam quid docuerit Plato, vel consuerit Cato. Cujus rei luculentum habemus exemplum in Eunucho Terentii.

Ut tandem rei versatis in Gentilium, aut Antiquorum Patrum scriptis evidentissime illustrandæ finem faciam. *Capitolium* appello, summi inter Gentiles numinis, domicilium, Jovis O. M. Sedem, Arcemque. Quid illa Jovis domus de habitatore suo nobis narrat, nisi hominem fuisse? Illic religiosè servabatur Jovis Scutum, quod Ægida vocabant, capræ, quæ Jovem parvulum lactaverat pelle tectum. Capra etiam illa locum ibi habuit, *Amalthea* dicta. *Quid de Iove senserunt, qui ejus nutricem in Capitolio posuerunt?* Ait Augustinus l. VI. de Civ. Dei c. VII. Erant ibi ulteriùs *Iuno*, & *Minerva*, *Conjux*, *Sororque*, & *filia Iovis*. *Numquid & Capitolia Romanorum, opera sunt Poëtarum?* Aio cum Augustino, lib. I. de Cons. Euang. c. XXIII. *Quid sibi vult ista non Poëtica, sed planè inimica varietas, Deos secundum Philosophos in libris quærere, secundum Poëtas in Templis adorare?* Hæc Augustinus. Hæc confirmant quæ supra dixi, nullam fuisse *Religionem Philosophicam*, quia in Templis sola Poëtica, quæ etiam civilis erat, dominabatur.

Frustra proinde jactabant Philosophi se unum Deum colere sub *Iovis* nomine, illum *Optimum* & *Maximum* esse, cui *Augustas Sedes*, & *Capitolia constituerunt immania. Dissimilia quippe copulare atque in unam speciem inducta confusione cogere conabantur*, ait Arnobius lib. I. *Nam Deus omnipotens mente unâ omnium, & communi mortalitatis* (mortalium hominum) *assensu, neque geniteus scitur, neque novam in lucem aliquando esse prolatus nec ex aliquo tempore cœpisse esse, vel secula. Ipse est enim fons rerum, sator sæculorum, ac temporum. Non enim ipsa per sè sunt; sed ex ejus perpetuitate perpetuâ, & infinitâ semper continuatione procedunt. At vero Iupiter (ut vos fingitis) & Patrem habuit, & Matrem, avos, avias, fratres: nunc nuper in utero matris suæ formatus, absolutus mensibus, & consummatus ætatem, ignotam sibi in lucem sensu irruisse vitali. Ergo si hæc ita sunt, Iupiter esse Deus, qui potest? Cum illum, Deum, esse perpetuum constet: & perhibeatur à vobis alter & dies habuisse natales, & pavefactus re novâ lamentabilem edidisse vagitum?*

Æque apparet illa contradictio in Virgilio limati judicii viro, & alioqui

alioqui *Decori* observantissimo: qui lib. IX. Georgicorum de Apibus ait:

——— Naturæ Apibus, quas Iupiter ipse
Addidit, expedientes, pro quâ mercede canoros
Curetum sonitum crepitantisque ærea secutæ
Dictæo cæli Regem pavêre sub Antro.

Ecce clarè dicit cæli Regem *in Dictæi montis antro* delituisse, quo scilicet, *Saturni* Patris fædam ingluviem devitaret: illic ab Apibus nutritum, earum labore, & argumentosâ industriâ. Quibus in præmium obsequii in tantis angustiis atque periculis constituto impensi, hanc ipsam idolem indiderit. Quid hic aliud dicere possumus, videndo homines alioqui sapientes adeo desipuisse, quàm Deo gratias habere, qui per filium suum nos veræ sapientiæ semitas edocere dignatus est, & fidei lumine inter cæcos errorum ambages gressus nostros dirigere.

Denique, nisi dicamus omnes Gentilium Deos homines fuisse, & quidem pessimos, quâ ratione Patres omnes omnesque primi, & trium sequentium sæculorum Christiânos, ab horribili blasphemiâ vindicabimus, qui Deos Paganorum, de Furto, Adulterio, Homicidio, Parricidio, Incestu, aliisque criminibus accusarunt? Caduntne ista in Deum verum? Possuntne ei sine execrandâ blasphemiâ exprobrari? Exprobrarunt tamen omnes Christiani Diis Gentilium, ipsi nominatim Jovi, quem tu, mi Morlæe, ais esse Deum verum. Nec patet ex iis Christianis ullum inventum fuisse qui tam detestandam calumniam, flammis ultricibus expiandam retractârit unquam, aut de eâ Pœnitentiam egerit; sed quam voce, & calamo viventes instituerunt accusationem, eam morientes sanguine suo obsignarunt. Væ Cypriano, væ Cyrillo, væ Augustino, Justino Martyri, Arnobio, Athenagoræ, Theophilo Antiocheno, aliisque, qui Gentilium impugnarunt Deos, & Catholicæ adversus eos dogmata defenderunt, siquidem gravissimæ calumniæ rei in impœnitentiâ finali infelices animas exhalarunt æternis flammis cruciandas. Sed absit quidquam mali de Beatis illis animabus Deo fruentibus suspicemur, quorum Sanctitatem

orbis Suffragiis, Deus miraculis declaravit, confirmavitque. Falsissima proinde sunt, Doctissime Morlæe, pace tuâ dictum sit, & à veritate, alienissima, quæ de *Summo supremoque Gentilium Deo* tradis. Paganorum Religio circa mortuorum cultum versabatur: Verus Deus ab eorum Templis, perinde ac à Ritibus, à Sacris libris, à Poëtarum fabulis, ab impudicis ludis, exulabat.

SECTIO XVII.

Gentiles Dæmonibus divinum cultum exhibuerunt.

IN Theatris, in Sacris, in ipsis Templorum adytis eam erat invenire impietatem, quæ non solum à Deo, aut Angelis, sive Beatis hominum animabus, aut etiam hominibus probis, & honestis; sed ne quidem à damnatis hominibus, quantumvis in malo obduratis, proficisci posse videatur, qua ratione colligunt Patres fuisse malos dæmones, qui adorabantur. Si enim verum sit, quod refert Christus Domini (& quis sine impietate negabit verum esse) Divitem Epulonem in inferno sepultum, ab aliquo ab inferis reverso, fratres suos superstites de periculoso in quo erant statu, tam ferventer optasse admoneri, ne ipsi in locum illum tormentorum venirent; ob aliquem residuum in eo erga fratres naturalem affectum non penitus in morte extinctum: quidni dicere licebit restare in animabus damnatis non nihil naturalis affectus in homines superstites, qui tametsi non efficiat, ut illis salutem plenam aut etiam piam vitam optent; segniores tamen efficit & tardiores, ad pravos mores fovendos. Quæ verò facta fuerunt à Gentilium Diis, talia sunt, quæ non videantur fieri posse, nisi ab eo, qui cùm Deo summe bono similis esse ambiret, nec assequi posset, primus in malis, mali omnis fons & origo factus est, & quam Deus habet in Bonitate, ipse in malo infinitatem affectat habere. Nec solus ita censeo: si quidem & alii Patres idem dixerunt? Athenagoras leg. pro Christianis p. XXIX. Οἱ τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀφίστανται θεοὶ, καὶ τοῖς εἰκόσιν ἐπονομαζόμενοι, οἷς ἐστὶν οὐ τῆς καθ' ἑαυτοὺς ἰσοτίμως αἰδέσεως, ἄνθρωποι γεγόνασιν· καὶ τὸν μὲν δαίμο-

δαίμονας εἶναι τὰς ἐπιφαινόντας τοῖς ὀνόμασι, πίστις ἡ ἐκάστου αὐτῶν ἐνέργεια. *Dii illi, qui vulgo hominum placent, & sua statuis nomina communicant, ut ex ipsorum historiis constat, homines fuerunt. Qui verè hominum illorum sibi nomen assumunt, dæmones sunt, ut ex eorum Actionibus apparet.* Actiones ergo illæ quarum Auctores fautoresque erant Gentilium Dii, tales erant, ut nequidem à malis damnatorum spiritibus prodire possent, ex mente Athenagoræ, qui in hoc non est solus.

Tertullianus dæmones, male scilicet, asserit à Paganis adoratos fuisse, idque ex eorummet confessione probat. *Datur hic aliquis sub tribunalibus vestris*, inquit, Apologetici c. XXIII. *Quem à dæmone agi constet, jussus à quolibet Christiano loqui spiritus ille tam se Dæmonem confitebitur, de vero, quam alibi Deum de falso. Æquè producatur aliquis ex iis, qui de Deo pati existimantur nisi se dæmones confessi fuerint, Christiano mentiri non audentes, ibidem illius procacissimi Christiani sanguinem fundite. Quid isto opere manifestius? quid hac probatione fidelius? simplicitas veritatis in medio est, virtus illi sua assistit .... si alterâ parte verè Dii sunt, cur sese dæmonia mentiuntur? an ut nobis obsequantur? Iam ergo subjecta Christianis Divinitas vestra, nec Divinitas deputanda est, quæ subdita est homini, & si quid ad Decus facit, æmulis suis. Si alterâ parte dæmones sunt* (nempe boni) *vel Angeli, cur se alibi pro Diis agere respondent? .... Cum ergo utraque pars concurrit in confessionem, Deos esse negans, agnoscite unum genus esse, id est dæmones,* nimirum malos.

Origenes l. VIII, contra Celsum, post principium: *Id dicimus ubique, gentium Deos esse dæmones.*

Minutius Felix: *Hæc omnia sciunt plerique pars vestrum, ipsos dæmones de semetipsis confiteri, quoties à nobis tormentis verborum, & orationis incendiis de obsessis corporibus exiguntur. Ipse Saturnus, & Serapis, &* JUPITER, *& quisquid dæmonum colitis, victi dolore, quod sunt eloquuntur. Nec utique in turpitudinem sui, nonnullis præsertim vestrum assistentibus mentiuntur. Ipsis testibus esse eos dæmones de se verum confitentibus credite: adjurati enim per Deum verum, & solum, invisi, miseri, &c.*

Julius Firmicus: *Ecce dæmon est: quem colis, cum Dei, & Christi ejus nomen audierit contremiscit.*

Cyrillus Alex. l. VI. contra Julianum, pag. CCII. *Licet hodieque videre Sanctos, ac venerabiles viros in virtute Christi per Spiritum sanctum impuros dæmones increpare, & quos illi,* Pagani, *Deos, ac servatores esse credunt, orationis virtute conterere, & manus contactu cruciare.*

Gregorius Thaumaturgus teste altero Gregorio Nysseno nullis exorcismis solo verbodæmones, sive Deos Gentilium abigebat. Unde secuta unius sacrificuli conversio sanè notabilis, ut apud eundem Nyssenum videre est.

Eusebius l. III. de Demonst. Euang. c. VIII. *Quis ignorat,* inquit, *nostræ consuetudinis esse, ipso Iesu nomine, & purissimis precibus omnem dæmonum vexationem abigere? sic ipsius Iesu verbum, ejusdemque doctrina isto potestatis invisibilis genere, ut omnes nos longè potentiores essemus efficit: Dæmonum itaque hostes, & inimicos; non autem familiares, & amicos nos reddens.* Hæc Eusebius calumniam diluens ab Ethnicis in Christianos confictam, quasi dæmonum ope mirabilia facerent, & diabolicâ magiâ grassarentur. Confutat autem illud Gentilium mendacium, ostendendo Christianos ea facere, non orando, dæmonibusve supplicando, quod magorum est; sed imperando virtute divinitus acceptâ.

Adde Prudentium in Apotheosi.

——— Torquetur Apollo
Nomine percussus Christi, nec fulmina verbi
Ferre potest, agitant miserum tot verbera linguæ
Quot laudata Dei resonant miracula Christi.
Intonat Antistes Domini: fuge callide serpens,
Exue te membris, & spiras solve latentes.
Mancipium Christi fur corruptissime vexas?
Desine, Christus adest humani Corporis ultor.
Non licet ut spatium rapias, cui Christus inhæsit.
Pulsus abi vemosa liquor, Christus jubet, exi.
Hæs inter voces medius Cyllenius ardens
Ejulat, & notos suspirat Iupiter ignes.

Cyprianus omitti non debet cujus hæc sunt verba, l. ad Demetrianum. *Osi audire eos vellet, & videre, quando à nobis adjurantur, & torquentur spiri-*

spiritualibus flagris, & verborum tormentis de obsessis corporibus ejiciuntur, quando ejulantes, & gementes, voce humanâ, & potestate divinâ flagellis & verberibus sentientes, venturum judicium confitentur. Veni, & cognosce, vera esse, quæ dicimus. Et quia sic Deos colere te dicis, crede; aut si volueris & tibi credere, de reipsô loquetur, audiente te, qui nunc pectus tuum obsedit, qui nunc mentem tuam ignorantiæ nocte cæcavit. Videbis sub manu nostrâ stare vinctos, & tremere captivos, quos tu suspicis, ac veneraris, ut Dominos. Certè vel sic confundi in istis erroribus tuis poteris, quando conspexeris & audieris Deos tuos, quid sint, interrogatione nostrâ statim prodere, & præsentibus licet vobis, præstigias illas, & fallacias suas non posse celare. Hæc Cyprianus.

Non igitur Heroes erant, id est animæ præstantiorum hominum, aut eorum, qui supra communem hominum sortem feliciori geniturâ eminuerant in hac vitâ, quos Pagani colebant ut Deos, quique vel in statuis oracula edebant, vel Energumenorum corpora torquebant, sed veri Caco-Dæmones, veri Diaboli, veri nequam Spiritus. Etiam ipse *Iupiter ille Deûm Pater, atque hominum Rex*; quem disertè nominant Minutius, & Prudentius: alii subintelligunt, & in generali propositione exprimunt.

Obiter observari velim singulare donum, potestatem humanâ majorem à Deo concessam fidelibus omnibus & singulis in impurissimos illos Ethnicorum Deos quæ jam unisacrorum ministrorum ordini solemni inauguratione conferitur. Exorcistas intelligo. De hoc fortè aliqua dicemus in Appendice.

Quod in hac Sectione contendimus, Augustinus triplici argumento probat, scilicet, malos Dæmones fuisse quos Ethnici coluerunt ut Deos. Primum habetur lib. 1. de consensu Evang. ca. xxv. Gentilium Deus non prohibebat ullum aliû Deum coli, præter verum Deum; & verus Deus eos omnes adorari vetuit. *Iupiter* ait Augustin. *non prohibet Saturnum coli, quem regno exuerat; nec Saturnus Iovem. Saltem Vulcanus prohiberet coli Martem uxoris suæ adulterum: Hercules Iunonem persecutricem suam,* (quod tamen non faciunt) *Quæ ista inter eos est tam fœda consensio, ut nec Diana virgo casta coli prohibeat, non dicam Venerem; sed Priapum? .... dicant, quod placet, interpretentur quod sapiunt, dum tamen omnia eorum argumenta*

pertur-

perturbat Deus Israël. Qui cum illos omnes coli vetuerit,... eorumque simulachris, & sacris, eversionem præceperit, prædixerit, & fecerit, satis ostendit illos falsos atque fallaces, & se esse verum, ac veracem Deum.

Secundum ejusdem argumentum habetur l. 11. de Civ. Dei c. 1v. ubi cum retulisset obscæna Carmina quæ in honorem Matris Deorum cantari solebant, qualia nemo mentis compos coram Matre suâ proferret: addit: *Quæ sunt sacrilegia, si ista sunt sacra? aut quæ inquinatio, si illa lavatio? & hæc fercula appellabantur, quasi celebrarentur convivium, quo velut suis epulis immunda dæmonia pascerentur. Quis enim non sentiat, cujusmodi spiritus talibus obscænitatibus delectentur: nisi vel nesciens utrum omnino sint ulli immundi spiritus, Deorum nomine decipientes, vel talem agens vitam, in quâ istos potius quam Deum verum, & optet propitios, & formidet iratos?* Deinde c. v. sacrorum eidem Deûm Matri factorum fædam obscænitatem refert, & c. v111 Scenicorum Ludorum turpitudinem. Denique c. x111, probat Deos esse non posse, qui tam turpia in suis sacris imperabant.

Denique l. x. operis mox laudati, cap. xv1, probat eos nullo modo bonos spiritus esse posse, qui divinos honores sibi exhiberi curabant, & à veri Dei cultu, imò & cognitione homines, quantum fieri poterat, abducebant. Hoc autem fecerunt illi nequam spiritus. Quo argumento usus est etiam est Cyrillus l. 1v. cont. Jul. p. cxxxi. *Homines abduxerunt*, inquit, *ne omnino cognoscerent, quis naturâ, ac verè universorum opifex sit, ac Dominus: sibi autem honores arripiunt ab Omnibus, sacrificia, festos dies, hominibusque persuaserunt, ut ipsorum cultui tantum incumberent.* Effectus apparuit in Israëlitis qui Judic. 111. 7. *dicuntur obliti Dei sui, colentes Baalim, & Astaroth.*

Ex sacris Litteris confirmabimus ea, quæ hactenus ex Patribus, & rationibus Theologicis asseruimus. Ps. xc. v. 5. *Omnes Dii Gentiũ dæmonia.* Deinde Psal. cv. 37. *Immolaverunt filios suos, & filias dæmoniis.* Et Deut. xxxii. 17. *Immolaverunt dæmoniis, & non Deo, Diis, quos ignorabant: novi recentesque venerunt* (scilicet Dii) *quos non coluerunt Patres eorum.* Et v. 21. *Ipsi me provocaverunt in eo, qui non erat Deus.* Illum scilicet Deo vero præferentes & v. 37. *Vbi sunt Dii eorum, in quibus habebant fiduciam?*

De

De quorum victimis comedebant adipes, & bibebant vinum libaminum. Surgant, & opitulentur vobis, & in necessitate vos protegant. Videte, quod ego sim solus, & non sit alius Deus præter me. Baruch. IV, 7. *Exacerbatis eum, qui fecit vos Deum æternum, immolantes dæmoniis, & non Deo.* Hęc ex veteri Testamento. Ex novo æquè clara habentur. Rom. I. dicitur quod Philosophi non coluerint Deum. I. Cor. X. 20. *Quæ immolant gentes, dæmoniis immolant, & non Deo.* Et Galat. IV. 8. *Tunc quidem ignorantes Deum, iis, qui naturâ non sunt Dii servietis.* Hæc Spiritus sancti verba quomodo cum tuo paradoxo conciliabis, clarissime Morlæe? Pronunciat Spiritus sanctus *omnes Deos Gentium esse dæmonia*: Tu asseveras præcipuum eorum Deum non fuisse dæmonem. Spiritus sanctus ait *Gentiles immolavisse dæmoniis, & non Deo*; tu dicis Deo immolavisse. Ille dicit: Idololatras *novos Deos recentesque coluisse, quos non coluerunt Patres eorum.* Tu dicis eos Antiquum, & æternum Deum coluisse, quem ab initio coluerant eorum Patres. Ille denique affirmat Gentiles eos *coluisse, qui naturâ non sunt Dii*; tu dicis eos illum qui naturâ Deus est, adorasse. Hæc, si Sophistarum in Logicâ regulæ subsistant, cum contradictoria sint, vera simul esse non possunt: quare aliæ propositiones sunt necessariò falsæ, aliæ veræ, Tuum erit videre, an malis agnoscere te errasse, & veritati à Spiritu sancto revelatæ subscribere, ejuratâ temerariâ tuâ assertione; an verò eâ retentâ falsi crimen in Spiritum sanctum rejicere.

Vides, Amplissime Morlæe, quam difficilem in te Provinciam ultrò susceperis, Probandi Paganos, Deum verum, ut omnium bonorum largitorem adorasse: dæmones ab iis cultos ut *Mediatores, Intercessores*, & *Patronos*. Ethnicos id tantum petiisse, ab istis, ut suas Deo vero preces offerrent, quod fit in Ecclesiâ Catholicâ, in cultu Angelorum, & Sanctorum. Ostende si potes ex ullo rituali Paganico, orationes Hæroibus hoc modo conceptos: *Hercules ora pro nobis: Romule*, sive *Quirine intercede pro nobis apud Iovem, ut tuis precibus placatus, victoriam ipse nobis largiatur.* Profer tabulas, exhibe testimonia, lege nobis vel has, vel his similes, aut similem sensum exhibentes preces, & rem feceris tuâ eruditione, & nostrâ consideratione dignissimam. Sed frustrà hæc à te

expectamus, quæ dari non possunt, quia neque sunt neque unquam fuerunt in rerum naturâ.

Jam tempus est, prolixæ disputationi finem imponam; quam idcirco prolixiorem esse permisi, quia de rebus agit à communi, tritâque Scholarum viâ remotis. Semel fundamenta jacere debui, quibus reliqua securè nitantur. Jam expeditiores ad alia transimus.

SECTIO XVIII.

Sanctorum Invocatio in Ecclesiâ Romanâ differt à dæmonum culcu inter Ethnicos.

D. Morlaus p. 22. *Cultum dæmonibus exhibitus, erat illorum Invocatio, in Imaginibus veneratio, Templorum, & Altarium dedicatio, votorum in morbis, & periculis nuncupatio, Tabularum votivarum & donariorum post defunctos a periculis in delubris eorum suspensio, denique ad loca, quæ illi sacra & maximè chara esse existimabantur, Peregrinatio.*

Et vidè quæso an non hæc omnia eadem nomine, in honorem Sanctorum, & Angelorum; sed revera in contumeliam Dei & Christi, à Christianis nunc fiunt?

Resp. Ita pridem omnia benè perpendimus: vidimus quidquid in honorem Sanctorum, aut vivorum, aut etiam mortuorum, & Angelorum fit, nihilque illic observavimus, in Dei, aut Christi ejus contumeliam à nobis fieri; è contra cuncta in Dei gloriam cedere certi sumus: utpote, qui Deum in Sanctis colimus, illius dona in illis veneramur, cum illorum precibus nostras unâ Deo exhiberi postulamus, atque ut exaudiantur, oramus, *per Christum Dominum nostrum*; & si quid fuerit impetratum, Deo id acceptum ferimus, illique *per eundem Christum Dominum nostrum* Gratias habemus. Hæc dicis esse in Deum contumeliosa? Quare sic? ex vestris nullus hactenus inventus est tam duræ frontis, ut dicat Paulum contumeliâ Christum affecisse, dum Romanos, dum Hebræos, Thessalonicenses, Philemonem, alios, ut pro-

se

se orarent, oravit, locis supra laudatis. Quod si sejungi possint, & de facto separentur à *Dei*, *Christique* contumeliâ preces sanctis in hac vitâ mortali degentibus oblatæ, cur necessariò conjunctam habebunt utriusque contumeliam, illæ quæ Sanctis cum Deo regnantibus offeruntur? siquidem utrique (aut ut melius dicam iidem in diverso statu) considerantur, ut à peccatis puri, ut Sancti, ut Dei servi, ut Deo grati, ut ejus amici, apud eum potentes, ei familiares, &c: quos libenter audit, quorum orationes amanter excipit, in quorum gratiam multa largitur, alioqui neganda. Et has Sanctorum præ aliis prærogativas à Sola Dei misericordiâ profectas agnoscimus, absque qua forent, non magis ipsi, quam quilibet è Peccatorum grege, Deo grati, neque suis nos precibus possent sublevare. Quæ in his omnibus Dei, quæ Christi contumelia vel fingi potest, cum omnia à Dei Gratiâ per Christi merita proficiscantur, & ad Dei, & Christi ejus laudem & honorem tendant, & in eo conquiescant, *Deus sit A. & Ω. Principium & finis omnium?*

Sed Manichæos in hac accusatione imitaris, optime Morlæe, qui, teste Augustino l. xx. contra Faustum cap. xx. & duobus sequentibus, nihil à Christianis fieri volebant, quod fuisset à Paganis factum. Unde sequeretur, ait optimè sanctus Doctor, nec virginitatem servari oportere, quam Vestales observarunt, nec tectis, vestibus, lavacris, conjugio, terræ fructibus, cibo, potuve, utendum esse, quoniam his omnibus Pagani sunt usi. Quæ sequela adeo absurda est, ut id exposuisse sufficiat. *Dum vitant stulti vitia, in contraria currunt.* Sic fecêre Manichæi. Hoc vero adeo est contra mentem S. Augustini, ut nequidem ipsa Gentilium sacrificia damnet, nisi propter adjunctam circumstantiam objecti, quod respiciebant: & insuper eam fuisse Pauli mentem asseveràt. Hæc ejus sunt verba cap. XVIII, libri supra laudati. *Dicit Apostolus: Quæ immolant Gentes, dæmoniis immolant, & non Deo: Non quod offerebatur vitians, sed quia illis offerebatur.* Unde deducit, non ideo repudianda sacrificia, Deo offerenda quia Gentiles suos falsos Deos, Judæi Deum verum illis coluissent: res bonas non illico malas evadere, quia pravum in finem ab aliquibus adhibentur; inde-

que malus fiat illarum usus; sed ille fine seposito licitum esse illarum usum. Consonat Hieronymus lib. contra Vigilant. cap. III. ubi huic argumentum tuum, urgenti, respondet: *Illud fiebat Idolis, & idcircò detestandum; Hoc fit Martyribus, & idcircò recipiendum.*

Talia sunt, quæ à te recensentur, iis coloribus præteritos Gentilium mores astutè repræsentante, ut praxeos hodiernæ Catholicorum imaginem velle facere videaris, malignè suppresso mali fonte, unde quidquid à Paganis fiebat, inficiebatur, quod scilicet omnia illa dæmoniis facerent; & non Deo, & quidem sistendo in eis, quasi veri Dii essent, vera numina. Hoc patet ex Sec. XVIII. Ceterum quo majus verbis meis pondus accedat, ea Patrum testimoniis confirmabo. Vnde patebit ulterius non aliam esse primitivæ Ecclesiæ, aliam hodiernæ praxim; sed unam eandemque.

Augustinus lib. XX, contra Faustum cap. XXI. *Nobis calumniatur Faustus,* Morlæus, *quod Martyrum memorias honoremus, in hos dicens nos Idola convertisse.* Hæc est objectio tua. En solutio. *Populus Christianus memorias Martyrum religiosâ celebritate concelebrat, & ad excitandam imitationem, & ut meritis eorum consocietur, atque orationibus adjuvetur, ita tamen, ut nulli Martyrum; sed ipsi Deo Martyrum sacrificemus, quamvis in memorias Martyrum constituamus altaria. Quis enim Antistitum in locis Sanctorum Corporum assistens Altari aliquando dixit: offerimus tibi Petre, aut Paule, aut Cypriane; sed quod offertur, offertur Deo, qui Martyres coronavit, ut ex ipsorum locorum admonitione, major afficlus exurgat, ad acuendam charitatem, & in illos, quos imitari possumus, & in illum, quo adjuvante possumus.*

Et lib. VIII, de Civit. Dei cap. XXVII, ait: *Epulas, quæ deferuntur ad memorias Martyrum, non esse sacrificia, novit, qui novit unum, quod illic Deo offertur sacrificium Christianorum. Nos itaque Martyres nostros nec divinis honoribus, nec humanis criminibus colimus, sicut colunt illi* (Pagani) *Deos suos: nec sacrificia illis offerimus, nec eorum probra, in eorum sacra convertimus.* Hęc ex Augustino.

Eo senior Hieronymus Epist. lib. III, ad Riparium acerrimè invehitur in Vigilantium, qui Catholicos vocabat *Cinerarios*, & *Idololatras*

(quod

(quod tu facis) quia Martyrum ossa venerarentur. *Nos*, inquit, *non dico Martyrum Reliquias; sed ne solem quidem, non Lunam, non Angelos, non Archangelos, non Cherubim, non Seraphim, & omne nomen, quod nominatur & in præsenti sæculo & in futuro, colimus, & adoramus* (videlicet cultu Latriæ) *ne serviamus creaturæ, potius quam creatori, qui est benedictus in sæcula. Honoramus autem Reliquias Martyrum, ut eum, cujus sunt Martyres, adoremus; honoramus Servos ut Servorum honor redundet in Dominum, qui ait: qui vos suscipit, me suscipit.*

Et lib. adversus Vigilantium; cap. III. *Dicis in libello tuo, quod dum vivimus, mutuò pro nobis orare possumus, post quam autem mortui fuerimus, nullius sit pro alio exaudienda oratio, præsertim cum Martyres ultionem sui sanguinis obsecrantes, impetrare non quiverint. Si Apostoli, & Martyres adhuc in corpore constituti possunt orare pro cæteris, quando pro se debent esse solliciti, quantò magis post coronas, victorias, triumphos?* Non opus erit attentum Lectorem admonere, non solùm summam esse conformitatem, Vigilantii doctrinam inter, & modernorum hæreticorum; sed etiam eodem prorsus telo instructos in arenam adversus Ecclesiam descendisse: unde patet similiter summam esse conformitatem, imo & identitatem inter Catholicorum hujus sęculi, doctrinam, & eam quæ Hieronymi ætate tradebatur in Ecclesiâ.

Quod vero non sit Martyribus subtrahendus ille cultus, quia Idolis aliquid ejusmodi fiebat, docet his verbis: *Idololatras appellas ejusmodi homines. Non diffiteor omnes nos, qui in Christo credimus, de Idololatriæ errore venisse, non enim nascimur; sed renascimur Christiani. Et quia quondam colebamus Idola, nunc Deum colere non debemus, ne simili eum honore videamur cum Idolis venerari. Illud fiebat Idolis, & idcircò detestandum: hoc fit Martyribus, & idcirco recipiendum est.*

Eusebius lib. IV. hist. c. XV. habet Epistolam Ecclesiæ Smyrnensis, in qua cum Judæi ob honorem B. Polycarpo delatum, suspicarentur Christianos Christum deserturos, & Polycarpo adhæsuros, ostendunt fideles aliter se Christum Martyrum caput, ac Dominum, aliter Martyres Christi servos venerari.

Deinde cum Julianus Apostata Christianis exprobrasset, quod re-

lictis Diis gentium homines miseros & infelices colerent) de Christo Domino & Martyribus ita loquitur, quia ærumnosam vitam probrosa secundum mundum morte consummarunt) B. Cyrillus l. VI. cont. Julia. p. CCIII respondit, nos absolutè Christum adorare, quod sit verus Dei filius, verusque Deus. Et addit: *Sanctos Martyres neque Deos esse dicimus, neque divino cultu illos adorare solemus; sed affectus & honoris: quin potius summis honoribus illos ornamus, quod pro veritate strenuè certaverint, sinceritatemque fidei eo usque servarint ut animam ipsam contempserint, repudiatisque mortis terroribus periculum omne vicerint, & virtutis adeo mirabilis seipsos veluti quasdam imagines, vitæ hominum proposuerint. Quare nihil est absurdi, imo verò necesse erat, eos qui tam claris facinoribus excelluerunt, ornari perpetuis honoribus.*

Theodoretus sæpe de cultu Martyribus exhibito loquitur, semper piè, & Catholicè. Ad propositum faciunt quæ habet lib. VIII. de cur. Græc. Affect. *Victorum Martyrum templa clara, & conspicua cernuntur,* inquit, *magnitudine præstantia, & omni ornatus genere illustria. Neque ad hæc nos semel, bisve, aut quinquies quotannis accedimus; sed frequentes conventus celebramus: sæpe etiam diebus singulis horum Domino laudes decantamus, & qui integrâ sunt valetudine, hanc sibi conservari, qui autem morbo quopiam conflictantur, hunc depelli petunt. Petunt & liberos, qui his carent, & quæ sterilis sunt, rogant, ut matres fiant: qui donum adepti sunt, salvum id sibi servari postulant. Qui peregrinationem auspicantur aliquam ab his petunt, ut viæ sibi comites sint, ducesque itineris: qui sospites redierunt, gratias referunt. Non illos adeunt ut Deos; sed tanquam Divinos homines eos orantes, intercessoresque sibi ut esse velint, postulantes. Quod verò votorum compotes fiant, qui fideliter petunt, palam testantur illorum donaria, curationem inditantia. Alii enim oculorum, alii pedum, alii manuum simulachra suspendunt, ex Argento aurove confecta.*

Vides doctissime Morlæe quæ nunc fiunt in honorem Martyrum, etiam olim facta fuisse: hodiernam Ecclesiam priscæ vestigia premere, nec latum ab iis unguem discedere; nec auctum tanti temporis decursu cultum Martyribus exhibitum; sed in eodem gradu hærere: adeo religiosè servat Ecclesia mores antiquos, & Patrum Traditiones. Quod constat ex illis Theodoreti verbis. Quid enim in nostro

cultu

cultu reprehendis, quod illa non exhibeant? *Martyrum Invocationem?* Invocarunt & illi fideles. *Votorum in morbis & periculis nuncupationem?* Nuncuparunt, & illi, *& votorum compotes fiebant. Templorum & Altarium dedicationem?* Dedicarunt & illi, & quidem *clara, conspicua, ingentia, ornatissima. Donariorum suspensionem?* Suspenderunt & illi, & quidem Pretiosa, *ex auro argentove* confecta, *Peregrinationem ad eorum templa?* Olim illuc quotannis sæpè redibant Christiani. Ab his denique non tanquam à Diis; sed tanquam ab hominibus Deo gratis, petebant infirmi sanitatem, orbi Liberos, Peregrini tutamen, qui his potiebantur, ea sibi servari postulabant. Quid amplius, quid aliud, facimus nos? Illa communis erat Ecclesiæ Praxis, ab omnibus bonis approbata, quam Deus miraculis editis sibi gratam esse testatus est, Ecclesia probavit; nemo verò integræ famæ damnavit. Tales enim non sunt, aut Vigilantius, aut *Faustus Manicheus*, sæculorum suorum probra: Ex quibus nihil quod ad contrariæ sententiæ ornandam novitatem, fucandam impietatem faciat, adduci potest.

D. Morlæus p. 45. *Historia Religiosa, sive Patrum, non est Theodoreti quia narrat mortem Simeonis, ante quem Theodoretus obiit, teste Baronio. Sed nec liber de curandis Græcorum Affectionibus, quia Nicephorus illius non meminit, in operum Theodoreti catalogo.*

Resp. Agnosco hic genuinam Calvini prolem, Calvini spiritu turgidam: cujus est, ubi vi illatâ scripta aliqua in proprium sensum torqueri possunt, suis ea permittere Auctoribus, calamo correcta, id est perversa. Ubi corrigi nolunt Scalpello ex operibus illius Auctoris abscindere, & opera ipsa illis abjudicare. Historiæ Patrum Theodoreti esse testatur Nicephorus à te laudatus, l. XI. c. XLI, & lib. XIV, c. LIX, sed & ipse Theodoretus eam, veluti suum opus citat in historiâ Eccles. l. I. c. VII, & l. II, c. XXX, & lib. III, c. XXIV, & lib. IV, c. XXV, & c. XXVII, ejusdem etiam meminit idem Theodoretus in Epist. ad Eusebium Ancyranum. At narrat *Simeonis mortem* inquis, quem teste Baron. Superstitem reliquit, moriens. Respondeo, si id verum est, & non hoc etiam Calvini spiritu dicatur, malim dicere de alio Simeone loqui, aut non satis rem istam examinasse Baronium,

quàm

quàm falsum Theodoretum, opus pro suo agnoscentem, quod ipsius non erat. Maximè cum idem incommodum sequatur, si alteri tribuatur. Quia Theodoreti tempore extitisse eum, qui scripsit istam historiam, nemo negabit, qui scierit ab ipso citatam. Hinc achronismus idem est, sive Theodoretus, sive alius illius Auctor asseratur.

Liber de Cur. Græcorum Affect. Theodoreti est, 1, quia idem prorsus est illius, & aliorum ejus operum stylus. 2, quia eodem Scriptus est tempore, quo Theodoretus floruit: quia ait se cognovisse eos, qui Julianum Apostatam vidissent: & meminit persecutionis ante xxx. annos in Perside excitatæ: & l.v, Eccles. hist. c.xxxviii, idem tempus illi Persecutioni designat. 3. quia in quo vixit Auctor hujus libri Theodoreto convenit: quia libro, sive Sermone v. Nomades Israëlitas, aut Arabes, vicinos suos vocat: Cyrus autem, cujus ipse Episcopus fuit in Persidis finibus, non procul ab Arabibus sita erat. 4. ipse Theodoretus librum hunc suum esse testatur & epistolâ cxiii, ad S. Leonem: & quæstione 1. in Leviticum.

At *hujus libri non meminit Nicephorus*, inquis. Sed meminit ipse Theodoretus & Anastasius Nicenus, Nicephoro multò antiquior, & Theodoreto vicinior (vixit enim sæculo septimo, alter vero sæculo tandem duodecimo) qui integram ferè paginam ex eo exscripsit. Putat Peronius Nicephorum alio titulo nominasse opus istud: quod non improbabile est. Cæterùm quo jure Nicephori silentio nos premis, qui ejus positivo testimonio nihil defers? Theodoreto Nicephorus adscribit unum opus, & nihil curas: silet de altero, & fidem inde fieri vis. Est apud te *pondus, & pondus, mensura & mensura: utrumque abominabile apud Deum*. Prov. xx, 10.

D. Morlæus: *Diabolus sub specie majoris Reverentiæ erga Deum Philosophis suggessit, temerarium esse Deum immediatè adire: ideoque per mediatores dæmones ad eum appropinquandum, quibus acceptum ferre deberent, quidquid boni nanciscerentur. Unde nedum à cultu summi Dei; verùm etiam à cognitione ejus, ad cultum sui, sub dæmoniorum nomine, traduxit.*

Resp. hic paucis verbis multa dicis à veritate prorsus aliena, & apertè contraria: ob quæ, si dicacem nactus esses adversarium, erudito-

ditorum, imo omnium te ludibrio exponeret. Primum est: *Dæmonum cultum specie majoris Reverentiæ erga Deum introductum.* Alium hujus mali fontem norunt docti quique, & nos in operis hujus calce monstrabimus Deo dante: (Vide sapientiæ caput XIII.) Imo jam ostendimus, quando diximus Deos Paganorum fuisse homines, quorum nomina dæmones sibi imposuerunt. Porro nihil magis hunc cultum dæmonum, & Dei neglectum promovit, quam opinio negans illi Rerum humanarum Providentiam, imo & cognitionem; non verò alia opinio de Reverentiâ illi debitâ, cui impares forent homines.

2. Ait *Dæmonem id Philosophis suggessisse.* Quasi per Philosophos id obtinuisset dæmon. Contra 1. quia dæmonum cultus totum orbem, exceptâ Abrahæ familia occupaverat, antequam notum esset Philosophorum nomen, aut nata natio. Contra 2. Religio à Philosophis nec ortum habuit, nec incrementum. Dolor parentis ob ereptum sibi filium, & honor Regibus absentibus exhibendus, initium Idololatriæ dedit: quæ statuariorum Arti, & Poëtarum gratis carminibus incrementum suum debet. Philosophi his assurgere coacti fuerunt: & tametsi liceret his nugaces, stultasque Poëtarum de Diis fabulas & impugnare in scholis, & ridere in Theatris, non tamen semper id impunè fuit, quod & Socratis, & Aristotelis exempla docent.

3. *Initio dæmones cultos ut mediatores tantùm.* Constat initio adoratos, ut veros Deos. Doctrinam illam de mediatione dæmonum à Platonicis ortam supra diximus: hi verò multis sæculis sunt Ethnicâ superstitione juniores. Apuleio eam adscribit Augustinus lib. VIII. de Civ. Dei c. XVIII, non Platoni ipsi, non antiquioribus Platonicis. Fortè vel ex conversatione cum Judæis vel ex conflictu cum Christianis orta est illa sententia, quod viderent eorum argumentis responderi non posse, Polytheismo retento. Unde Platonici Juniores novam sibi viam aperuerunt, ut per Deos majorum Gentium, Dei summi Attributa intelligerent, per Deos minorum Gentium, dæmones inter summum illum Deum, & homines, mediantes.

D. Morlæus p. 22. & 23. *Postquam orisma jussit in sole hæ dæmoniorum umbræ evanescerent* (pro evanuerunt) *& Deus summus Sanctius colli cœpisset;*

 unico

nico illum inter, nosque mediatore patefacto, dæmon leonem induit, & suos cultores ad ferro flammâque persequendos Dei servos concitavit. Verum cum inde augeri fidelium numerum cerneret, quia sanguis Christianorum Ecclesiæ semen esset, ad artes veneratorias conversus, inde sementem sibi facere cogitavit, simplicibus hominibus persuadendo, quod Deo gratiores essent orationes ad memorias Martyrum factæ. Quam opinionem promoverunt miracula illic facta. Unde paulatim effectum ut Martyres & deinde Confessores, velut mediatores Deum inter, homines que admitterentur.

Respond. non miror à te Calvini discipulo dici promotam miraculis à Deo opinionem à dæmone satam, in hominum mentibus, cum sciam à Magistro tuo Deum Peccati Auctorem dici. Spero tamen apud æquos quosque rerum Arbitros, plus posse ad confirmandam opinionem illam Dei miraculis illam foventis auctoritatem, quam tua possit Assertio illam à dæmone satam asseverantis, ad illam evellendam. Sed unde tibi tam perspecta dæmonis consilia? num cum illo modium salis comedisti, quod se fecisse gloriatus est Patriarcha Reformationis hodiernæ? Quo Auctore ea à te dicuntur? nullo! Quo teste? nemine præter te. Magnam te inter illumque familiaritatem intercessisse ostendas oportet, ut persuadeas nobis ejus cordis secreta tibi tam explorata esse: absque quo fidem vix invenies. Nec satis erit, doceas eum ea tibi dixisse, nisi insuper fidem illius ipse præstes, qui *mendax est, & Pater ejus.*

SECTIO XIX.

Argumenta contra Sanctorum Invocationem.

D. Morlæus p. 24. *Magis sumus inexcusabiles, quam Ethnici, quia cum Christum habeamus nos inter & Deum mediatorem, stultum esset alium substituere, quia nemo apud Deum efficacior, nemo apud homines benevolentior.*

Resp. sciens & Prudens alienam à nobis mentem nobis exprobras. Nec enim Christum mediationis officio amovemus, ut alium illi substituamus; sed ut efficacius illum ad interecedendum excitemus. aliorum

rum petimus orationes, qui unà nobiscum idem à Deo petant *per Christum Dominum nostrum.* Hoc tu *Stultum* dicis; aliter sentit Apostolus, qui Sanctos viventes ut orarent, oravit: Aliter Concilium Chalcedonense, quod B. Flaviani petiit orationes: Aliter Ecclesia, quæ similiter Sanctos & vivos & mortuos invocat. Aliter ipse Christus, qui exauditum iri docuit preces à multis oblatas. Cyprianus lib. de Orat. Dom. ait: *Iussit unitatis Magister, quisque preces pro toto populo Christo offerat; non pro se solo.* Sive ergo soli oramus, quod minus efficax sive multi simul, iique sive vivi, sive vitâ functi, suum Christo constat mediatoris officium, quia utroque modo Deum oramus *per Christum Dominum nostrum.*

D. Morlæus p. 24. *Quod dicunt, unicum esse mediatorem Redemptionis, plures vero Intercessionis, falsum est. Nam intercedere, vox est forensis, quæ significat non simpliciter orare, aut postulare; sed suo jure atque potestate apud alium agere, & quo minus aliquid fiat, se, suamque auctoritatem interponere:* quod hîc Soli Christo competit.

Respond. Si daremus tibi vocem illam nunquam ab Antiquis aliter acceptam fuisse, quid hoc contra nos, qui aliter illam accipimus? nobis enim non aliud significat, quam orare, aut *humillimè postulare.* Cur usus ille non sufficiet ad mutandam vocis significationem, cum penes usum sit arbitrium, & jus, & norma loquendi, teste Poëtâ? nec verum est, unum tantum sensum eâ voce designatum apud probatos Auctores. Tribunos plebis non ut jus dicerent; sed ut intercederent, si quæ senatus Consulta plebis libertati contraria prodirent, ait Gellius Tertullianus l. 11, contra Marcionum. *Consequens erat,* inquit, *uti Deus secederet à libertate semel concessâ homini, id est, contineret imperio & præscientiam, & præpotentiam suam, per quos intercessisse potuisset, quo minus homo malè libertate suâ frui aggressus, in periculum laberetur.* S. Cypr. sæpe de iis loquitur, qui pænitentiam agentium lachrymis gemitibusque intercedebant. Quibus locis aliquam auctoritatem potestatemque significare videtur. Aliquando tamen de illo dicitur, quod inter duo extrema simpliciter interjacet: Cæsar lib. 1. de bello Gallico. *Non se hostem vereri; sed angustias itineris, & magnitudinem syl-*

varum, quæ inter eos, & Ariovistum intercederent. Et Gen. XLIII, 10. *Si non intercessisset dilatio*, jam *vice alterâ venissemus.* At verò aliquando significat pro aliquo preces interpositas. Gen. XXIII. 8. *Intercedite pro me apud Ephron, filium Seor, ut det mihi speluncam duplicem.* Et B. Aug. ad Deiparam Virginem: *Ora pro populo, interveni pro clero intercede pro devotò fæmineo sexu.* Et hoc ultimo sensu à nobis accipitur, quando Beatis dicimus: *Intercedite pro nobis.* Contra quem sensum nihil dicis.

D. Morlæus pag. 25. *Neminem ex Angelis vel Sanctis invocare possunt cum fide, quin illum cordis scrutatorem agnoscant: & præterea in illum, tanquam in Deum, credant: nam Apostolus ait: quomodo invocabunt, in quem non crediderunt?*

Resp. jam diximus Sanctos ista cognoscere, & varios modos indicavimus, quorum aliquo fieri possit, ut ista cognoscant, licet *omni scientiæ* participes non sint: satis enim ad id est omni-scientis, & cordium scrutatoris Dei Amicitia. Alia, quam adhibes ratio æquè frivola est. Si enim invocare possumus cum Apostolis Sanctos vivos, licet eos pro Diis non habeamus, nec *in eos*, strictè loquendo, *Credamus* (qui in Deum solum credimus) cur non & Sanctos mortuos? Sic Isaiæ XXXIV 12. *Regem potius invocabunt.* Et Oseæ VII, 1. *Ægyptum Invocabant.* Nec tamen aut hi in Ægyptum, & in Regem illi tanquam in Deum credebant. Nec Moyses Cælum & Terram Deum arbitratus est, cum ait, Deut. XXX, 19. *Testem invoco cælum & terram, quod proposuerim &c.* Aliter accipitur ab Apostolo illa vox: *Invocatio*, pro illâ solâ, quæ ad omnium Dominum, salutis æternæ largitorem dirigitur. En totus locus: *Idem Dominus omnium, Dives in omnes, qui invocant illum. Omnis enim quicumque invocaverit nomen Domini, salvus erit. Quomodo ergo invocabunt* (scilicet, ut omnium Dominum, divitem in omnes eum invocantes, qui iis æternam vitam largiatur *in quem non crediderunt.* Hac ratione Sanctos non invocamus; sed ut illius Domini Servos, apud eum, ex ejus misericordiâ, & Gratiâ, Potentes.

D. Morlæus p. 27, & 28. *Orant Papistæ Sanctos, non solum ut impetrent nobis aliquid à Deo; sed etiam ut ipsi ea præstent, quod patet legenti Breviarium Romanum, Horarium, Psalterium, & Litanias omnium Sanctorum.* Dicit una precatiuncula;

O Maria gratiosa,
Dulcis, mitis, & formosa,
Applica nobis gratiam.
Quod requiro, quod respiro
Mea sana vulnera:
Et da menti te poscenti,
Gratiarum munera.

Et in fronte Ædium publicarum Bruxellis, habetur hæc inscriptio:
A Bello, Peste, & Fame libera nos Maria.

Resp. 1. Tametsi daremus tibi aliquem privatum hominem in modo Sanctos invocandi modum ab Ecclesiâ præscriptum, & usitatum excessisse, quid hoc ad Ecclesiam, quæ singulorum dicta vel facta præstare nullâ lege tenetur? Quæ verò nobis hic exprobras, ex privatâ devotione manarunt: nec enim in Missali, aut Breviario Romano habentur.

Resp. 2. ejusmodi verba commodè explicantur, quòd optent iis utentes, B. Virginem ea facere, Deum orando, ut ea faciat. Sic & vos explicatis illa Apocalypseos 1. 4, verba: *Gratia vobis & Pax ab eo qui est, & qui erat, & qui venturus est, & à septem spiritibus, qui in conspectu Throni ejus sunt.* Quasi spiritus illi, perinde ac Deus ipse, Gratiam & Pacem largirentur. Cum tamen longè diverso modo ab illis proficiscantur, à Deo quippe donantur, spirituum illorum precibus exorato. Si simile quid à quopiam Catholico dictum fuisset, quas non tragædias excitarent tui similes, verborum aucupes, litium & satores, & quæsitores?

D. Morleus p. 28. *Quæ cum sit communis apud illos Beatam Virginem, aliosque Sanctos invocandi formula, certè aut nulla unquam fuit, aut hæc est Idololatria, cum sit invocatio directa, & absoluta; non verò relativa.*

Respondeo: Falsissimum est, illam esse communem Sanctos invocandi formulam. Ex pio quidem affectu, tametsi forte minus cauto (quem certè nemo unquam erroris jure damnabit) usurpata est à Bruxellensibus. At in Breviario, ac Missali, quæ precum formulas solemnes ab Ecclesiâ approbatas, continent, duplici tantum ratione Sancti invocantur. Prior in collectis, ad Deum ut Sanctorum preces pro

nobis exaudire dignetur. Posterior ad Sanctos ipsos: ut orent pro nobis. Tertia, quæ tibi displicet, tametsi errore vacet, & à non malignis rectè explicari possit, & commodè explicetur, rarò tamen adhibetur ab Ecclesiâ.

D. Morlæus p. 29. *Athanasius aliique Orthodoxi contra Arianos Christum Deum esse ex eo probarunt, quod invocaretur. Quod argumentum fuisset inefficax, si Sanctos Invocare licuisset.*

Resp. rectè probarunt illi Patres Christum Deum esse, quem invocabat ex Apostolicâ Traditione Ecclesia Invocatione directâ, & absolutâ, quali ad nullum Sanctum utimur. Obiter tamen observo, difficilem in se Provinciam suscipiet, qui probare volet demonstrativas esse omnes Patrum rationes adversus Arianos, illam nominatim ex Psal. XLIV. *Eructavit cor meum verbum bonum*: quam apud aliquos invenimus.

D. Morlæus p. 29. *In illis dogmaticis, & Didacticis veterum scriptis quæ Tertullianus, Cyprianus, Nyssenus, Augustinus, aliique de Invocatione eo fine scripserunt, ut alios docerent, quomodo orandum esset, nulla est de Invocatione Sanctorum mentio. Ex ejusmodi tamen scriptis, quæ sit eorum sententia certò scitur.*

Resp. Ex iis quæ dicunt in ejusmodi scriptis, certò scitur quid senserint eorum Auctores, non verò ex iis, quæ reticent: quia argumenta ab auctoritate negativa, infirma esse, notissimum est. Posses æquè benè inferre, nec Ecclesiam Romanam Sanctos orare quæ dum Orationem Dominicam explicat, de Sanctorum Invocatione nihil dicit. S. Ignatius etiam in suis Exercitiis spiritualibus totus est in tradendo modum orandi Deum. Dicesne propterea illum non existimasse Sanctos invocandos?

D. Morlæus, p. 29. *Si relativam Sanctorum Invocationem agnovissent Patres, cùm iis objicerent Ethnici, Martyres coli à Christianis, quomodo ipsi suos Heroas colerent, hoc non negassent Patres; sed ostendissent aliam esse rationem Martyrum, aliam Heroum. His enim summum cultum soli Deo debitum non dederunt Ethnici.*

Resp. Goliæ instar gladium adfers, non quo hostem ferias; sed quo ipse

ipse feriaris. Nam constat 1. ex cultu, & Invocatione Martyrum natam illam Gentilium objectionem: adeoque priscos illos Christianos verè coluisse, atque invocasse Martyres. Constat. 2. non negasse universim Patres à Christianis coli, & invocari Martyres; sed solùm illis offerri sacrificia, quæ soli Deo debentur. Templa in eorum honorem extructa, liquet ex Theodoreto, aliisque: Sacrificia illis oblata negat Augustinus, *Quis Antistitum*, inquit, *unquam dixit, offero tibi Petre, Paule, aut Cypriane?* non negat precibus nostris eos invocari debere. Similia alii Patres. Quorum unanimi, concordique sententiæ, dum nudam tuam Pythagoricam assertionē opponis, & à nobis præferri speras, nimis altè de te, nimis abjectè de tuis Lectoribus sentis. Falsum etiam est, quod ais, Ethnicos non dedisse Heroibus suis summum honorem soli Deo debitum. Singulos enim Heroes cælo donatos, sacrificiis, quæ soli vero Deo debentur, coluerunt, ut ostendimus Sect. XVI.

D. Morl. p. 31. *negari non potest, quin talis sit in Ecclesiâ Romanâ nunc Angelorum, & Sanctorum, qualis olim apud Gentiles Heroum, & dæmonum cultus fuit.*

Resp. & negari potest illa cultus similitudo, & de facto negatur. Et licet nostra negatio vestræ affirmationi præferri debeat, quia à vobis accusamur, & Rei partem sustinemus: adeoque nisi demonstrativè probetis, quæ dicitis, Vindiciæ secundum nos dari debent; tamen ex abundanti negationem nostram iis auctoritatibus probavimus, ut ad iis respondendum & te ipsum, cujus tamen eruditionem plurimi facio, & totam insuper nationem Calvinisticam in Angliâ audacter provocem. Differentiam inter utrumque cultum assignamus eandem, quam Patres *Augustinus, Theodoretus, Cyrillus*: Ethnicos scilicet Heroes suos veros Deos credidisse; nos Sanctos nostros Dei solùm amicos æstimare: Ethnicos Heroibus sacrificia, obtulisse; quæ nos uni Deo offerimus; non item Sanctis: illos suos Heroas invocasse invocatione absolutâ, & in ipsis terminatâ; nos verò solâ relativâ, & transitivâ Martyres invocare. Adeoque potiori jure nobis dicere licebit, asseri non posse inter nos talem esse cultum Beatorum, qualis inter Ethnicos fuit cultus Heroum.

D. Mor-

D. Morlæus: p. 31. *Constat ex temporum serie, à Iosepho meado observatâ, hæc tria, Sanctorum invocationem, cælibatus Sacerdotalis institutionem, & ciborum quorundam prohibitionem, ab iisdem Auctoribus, Monachis ad Episcopatum vectis, & eodem fere tempore ante finem quarti sæculi, in Ecclesiam publicè introduci cæpisse.*

Resp. nihil moror, quid observet meadus ille; sed quid probet. Si tamen dicat, illa tria eodem tempore cæpisse, ab iisdem Auctoribus fuisse commendata, negare non poterit Apostolos illorum trium dogmatum Auctores esse: siquidem ciborum delectus ab Apostolis injunctus fuit Act. xv, 20, & 29, quod à primis Christianis religiosè observatum, tradit Tertullianus Apolog. c. ix. Cęlibatus item Sacerdotum non aliud invenire est initium, quam Euangelii, sanctis Altarium ministris Orthodoxis ab ejus initio semper & ubique se ad exemplum summi Sacerdotis, Pastorum Principis, conformantibus, qui est Christus Jesus, Deus Benedictus in secula. Hæc obiter dicta sufficient in præsenti: eadem tibi fusius probata dabimus, si detur à te occasio.

D. Morl. p. 31. *Chemnitius ait circa annum Domini,* CCCLXXX, *per Basilium, Nyssenum, & Nazianzenum, Panegyricarum orationum occasione invectam in publicos cætus Invocationem Sanctorum: quamvis alii dicant ab iis non invectam; sed ministratam tantum aliis occasionem illam invehendi.*

Resp. Quid iterum Chemnitii nobis mentem opponis, qui non irrefragabilis est apud suos, qui non omnia ejus dicta probant? si ullus publici pudor, si ulla Lectorum reverentia, tam negligentèr scriberes, aut sperares Chemnitii objecto nomine, velut ostentato medusæ capite silentium nobis impositum iri, nedum contra veritatem; sed etiam contra omnem verisimilitudinem? Quanto enim probabilius est cultum illum Sanctorum (cujus magna pars erat eorum Invocatio) occasionem dedisse Panegyricis illis orationibus; non è contra: has Panegyres filias esse Invocationis Sanctorum, non matres, effectus non causas? Maximè cum constet longè ante tempus illarum Panegyrum, in publicis Ecclesiæ Liturgiis Sanctos invocatos fuisse, & hanc ipsam invocationem à Gentilibus fuisse Christianis exprobratam, nec

ab

ab his negatam; sed discrimen ab istis assignatum, inter modum, quo à Christianis Sancti, & quo ab Ethnicis Dii colebantur. Proinde tibi tuum remittimus Chemnitium; in quo si nihil aliud displiceret, quam quod hic ex illo profers, satis est, ut illum susque deque habeamus.

D. Morl. p. 32. *Nazianzenus (idem de aliis) dum de Sanctorum Invocatione loquitur, quasdam correctiones adhibet, ne ab Auditoribus suis secus quam oporteret intelligerentur, qualia sunt: ut puto, ut persuasum habeo, &c. qui sic loquuntur incerti sunt de re, quam ita leniunt.*

Resp. voces illiusmodi non semper ex dubitatione nasci. An dubius de sancti Spiritus assistentiâ Paulus, dum ait: 1. Cor. VII. 40. *Puto, quod & ego spiritum Dei habeam?* si dicam: *Persuasum habeo te execrari confratris tui Archiepiscopi Eboracensis facinus, qui deposito pedo Pastorali, gladium sumpsit adversus Regem.* Item *aliud Protestantium verorum Anglorum, qui Regem occiderunt, regnum everterunt, & in omnes ordines ferro, flammâ grassati sunt.* Item *detestari eorumdem Protestantium studia,* qui sub prætextu fabulosæ conspirationis à Catholicis initæ, veram formaverunt in regni perniciem. Si ista loquar, convenio illis vocibus conscientiam tuam, eam appello ab eâ testimonium postulo de re cunctis apertâ, etiam Calvinistis quam ipsa nec ignorare potest, nec negare. Cur non sic intelligi poterunt, quæ à Patribus simili modo dicuntur.

D. Morlæus p. 32. *Hæc est famosa illa Apostasia, de quâ Apostolus II. Thessal. II. & I. Timot. IV. quæ non continet plenam à Deo defectionem; sed aliarum rerum cum Deo cultum, dum Deus & Sancti coluntur. Est spiritualis fornicatio propter quam Meretrix Babylonica Macha dicitur, quia Christum maritum habet, & Sanctis se prostituit. Nam Macha non est, nisi sit uxor & meretrix, & talis uxor, quæ virum habeat.*

Resp. mitte obscuras Prophetias, ad quas nemo recurrit, nisi defectu solidarum rationum. Totus iste discursus hoc fundamento nititur: *Macha non est nisi quæ virum habet, & alteri se prostituit.* Puto tamen salvâ fide, dici posse, Mæchum fuisse sartoris uxorem, quæ ut fertur, relicto marito, Bezam, Genevam secuta est; nec peccaturum in Spiritum sanctum qui cum Christo (Mat. XIX. 9. Mar. X. 11. & Luc. XVI. 18) dicit eum Mæchari, qui dimissâ priori conjuge non fornicariâ

aliam ducit: itemque illum, qui Repudiatam ducit. Tu vide, quî subsistet tuus discursus, isto fundamento subducto.

D. Morlæus p. 33. *Nullius momenti est, quod à quibusdam responderi solet: Gentes aliis quam Deo sacrificasse; se verò Sanctos & Angelos invocare quidem; at sacrificium cultum esse soli Deo debitum. Nam 1. est Petitio principii, quod Invocatio Sanctorum non sit cultus Deo debitus. 2. Gentes eos invocabant, quibus sacrificabant. 3. omnia sacrificia in sacrificio Crucis consummata, & abolita fuerunt. Vnde nulla in novo fædere sunt sacrificia, nisi spiritualia, preces nimirum, & supplicationes: quæ vituli labiorum, & Thimiamata vocantur cum ergo Invocatio sit sacrificium spirituale, illa soli Deo fieri debet.*

Resp. ergo *nullius momenti* tibi sunt, quæ à Patribus dicuntur, ab *Augustino* enim, *Cyrillo*, & *Theodoreto* desumuntur. quæ contemptim rejicis, velut consideratione non digna: licet nomina celes, ne censura nimium inverecunda videretur. Rationes porrò tuæ verè nullius sunt momenti. Enimverò, quod Invocatio indirecta, non sit cultus Deo debitus, tam evidens est, ut à mentis compote negari non possit. Quis enim à Mahometis veneno intactus, Deum orabit, ut pro nobis oret? Quem orabit Deus? & ad quid? Constat ergo Invocationem transitivam ad Deum dirigi non posse, adeoque non esse cultum Deo debitum. Quod à paritate Invocationis Sanctorum vivorum ostenditur, quem si cultum Deo debitum asseras esse, ab Apostolis Idololatriæ crimen non amovebis. Vides in quas angustias Catholicos impugnandi studium te conjiciat? Quâ arte hinc exibis? Gentiles eos orabant, & quidem absolutè, quibus sacrificabant: idem facimus & nos: quia Deum invocamus, cui sacrificamus. Alios insuper invocamus, quibus sacrificium nullum offerimus, Sanctos nimirum, & vivos, & defunctos. Sacrificia Mosaica morte Christi consummata fuisse, verum est: tamen manere in novo fædere mundam & indefectibilem oblationem (sive sacrificium) & Malachiæ Prophetia, & Ecclesiæ Traditio testantur.

D. Morlæus p. 35. *Fundamentum cui* (quo) *nititur Sanctorum Invocatio, est illorum in cælis Dei intuitio. Vnde cum multi Patres* (Irenæus, Justinus M. Clemens Romanus, Lactantius, & alii) *negent Sanctos videre Deum,*

Deum, invocandi non sunt. Et si quis contrarium asserere videtur, necesse est, ut vel liber sit suppositicius, vel locus corruptus, vel Auctorem sibi contradicere. Nec Invocatio Sanctorum eo tempore erat introducta in praxim Ecclesiæ.

Respondeo: Ampla hæc illationum seges, uno ictu succiditur: quia ex principio falso deducuntur omnes. Non enim visio Dei motivum est unicum istius Invocationis: alioquin Sanctos vivos non invocaremus, quos novimus Deum non videre. Generale ergò motivum, cur Sanctos invocamus, est quod credamus eos esse Deo gratos, quos proinde exauditurus est. Augetur quidem spes de petitæ rei concessione, ex eo quod Deum intueantur: sed non in ea fundatur, ipsa invocatio.

D. Morlæus p. 35. *Pontificii tamen, quâ sunt modestiâ, & ex horum scriptis, & ex aliquibus veteris Testamenti locis, Sanctorum Invocationem adstruunt, licet Sanctorum veteris Testamenti animas in limbo detentas fuisse asserant. Quâ in Deum fide, in homines verecundiâ, aut secum ipsis Constantiâ ea testimonia proferre possint, ipsi viderint.*

Resp. *Habeat iam Roma pudorem.*

Tertius è cælo cecidit Cato ——

Eum amicè moneo, Censorem, modestiùs agat. Nos contradictionem facilè amolimur; imò jam amoliti sumus, dum ostendimus, non in Dei visione fundari Sanctorum Invocationem. Adeoque tam invocari potuisse Sanctos in limbo subterraneo detentos, ac Sanctos in carnis ergastulo clausos. Sic nostra in Deum fides, in homines verecundia constabit donec constiterint Apostolorum dictâ, & facta.

Quæ deinde habes ad paginam usque 54. inclusivè, de productis ab aliis Sanctorum testimoniis, pro Beatorum Invocatione, eorumque ignorantiâ rerum, quæ hic aguntur, cum aut contra ea, quæ dixi non sint, aut superiùs expensa fuerint, ideo de iis nihil opus est agere.

SECTIO XX.

Argumenta contra Orationes pro defunctis.

D. Morlæus p. 55. Augustinus tr. LXXXIV. in Joan. *Non sic ad ipsam mensam Martyres commemoramus, quemadmodum alios, qui in Pace requiescunt, ut etiam pro iis oremus; sed magis, ut ipsi orent pro nobis. Vbi advertendum, quod Defuncti, pro quibus Ecclesia tunc temporis orabat, requiescebant in Pace. Et proinde Oratio pro defunctis in veteri Ecclesiâ non ponebat, aut supponebat Purgatorium.*

Resp. Pari jure dicere posses nec Ecclesiæ hodiernæ preces pro Defunctis supponere Purgatorium: quia tantum pro illis orat, *qui nos præcesserunt cum signo Fidei, & dormiunt in SOMNO PACIS.* Ut habetur in Missali Romano.

Unde duo colligo non levis momenti. Primum est, Ecclesiam Romanam etiamnum veteris vestigiis insistere, cujus etiam verba immutata retinet.

Aliud est quâ fide tu, tuique similes Novatores in Antiquorum exponendis scriptis versemini: non enim ovum ovo similius, quam priscorum fidelium, hodiernorumque non modo mens, sed & ipsa verba. Unde tam facile esset præsentium Sermonem in alienum sensum detorquere ac antiquorum, Pugnatis tamen antiquos aliter sensisse, nec manifestæ veritati cedere vultis.

D. Morl. p. 55. *Ex illo loco colligi tantum potest Sanctorum intercessio; non verò eorum Invocatio: Nam aliud est Commemoramus, aut nominamus, aliud invocamus. Ait autem ibi Commemoramus: quod nominationem importat.*

Resp. *Commemorare, ut ipsi pro nobis orent,* est *Invocare.* Idem tantum non iisdem verbis ait Ecclesia hodierna: *Communicantes, & memoriam venerantes imprimis* &c. Quæ verba Sanctorum Invocationem continere, negari non potest. Eandem ergo significant invocationem etiam Augustini verba. Duas quippe commemorationes Defunctorum exhibent

hibent omnes Liturgiæ: prima de iis, qui certò Sancti sive Beati sunt. Secunda de iis, qui non valdè mali erant, at de quorum statu dubitabatur, an scilicet essent in cælo. Prima destinatur ad opem nobis Sanctorum Intercessione impetrandam. Altera ad animarum levamen. Et utramque Augustinus accuratè distinguit loco laudato dum ait: *Commemoramus alios, ut pro iis oremus, alios, ut pro nobis orent.*

D. Morl. p. 56. *Quando Augustinus ait: injuria est pro Martyre orare, cujus nos debemus, orationibus commendari: non loquitur de nostrâ Martyrum Invocatione, sed de eorum pro nobis intercessione tantum.*

Resp. Ex verbis prolatis constat loqui de eâ Martyrum commemoratione, quæ eos excitet ad orandum pro nobis. Ut vidimus paulò superius.

D. Morlæus p. 57. *Augustinus non ex propriâ sententiâ locutus est; sed ex aliorum. Credidit enim absolutè mortuos nec curam neque cognitionem rerum hujus vitæ habere. Sed quia Hieronymum, & alios magnos viros* (dicere debuisses omnes omnino fideles) *noverat aliter sentire aliqua ex aliorum sententiâ subdit, non per modum affirmantis; sed dubitantis, & quod in aliorum gratiam concederet: nam qui dicit se non videre quid inde emolumenti assequerentur, nisi hoc, non affirmat etiam hoc; sed affirmat tantum, nisi sit utile ad hoc, esse prorsus inutile.*

Resp. Accipio quod das, Hieronymum, aliosque magni nominis viros eadem nobiscum sensisse. Et verò praxis illa Italorum teste Paulino, Afrorum teste Augustino (nisi dicere malimus utroque teste omnium fidelium consuetudinem fuisse, sive ut Paulinus loquitur, *universæ Ecclesiæ*) opinione nititur tertii status animarum, quem jam communissimè Purgatorium appellamus. Martyres item invocandos eorumque intercessionem & vivis prodesse, & iis defunctis, qui ut ea sibi post mortem prodessent, meruissent. Hæc non minus Augustinus, quam Hieronymus, aut Paulinus sentit. Sed de quibusdam aliis dubitat de modo scilicet, quo Martyres sciunt, quæ hic aguntur: an solliciti & anxii de rebus nostris, quæ sepulturæ in tali loco utilitas: &c. quæ tamen ex ejusdem Ecclesiæ praxi, constabant, utpaset apud eundem.

D. Morlæus p. 58. *Alia responsio est: sepulti ad memorias Martyrum adjuvantur apud Deum, non quia ibi sepeliuntur; sed quod illis Deum orando commendantur. Martyribus, inquam, commendantur, orando Deum; non Martyres. Non enim illos Martyres orando; sed Deum orando se eorum patrocinio commendabant. Sicut nos orare Deum solemus, ut viventium pro nobis preces exaudiat. Vnde Sanctorum Invocatio hinc non evincitur. Et si quid impetretur, id non Martyribus; sed Martyrum Domino acceptum ferri debet.*

Resp. *Vis videri aliquid dicere*, ait Augustinus l. de Unitate Ecclesiæ c. XVIII. *Dum tacere erubescis, & inania loqui non erubescis. Commendantur Martyribus orando*, hoc fateris: negas orari Martyres. At quomodo *Commendantur Martyribus orando*, si non orentur Martyres? nec rem expedit, quod addis: *Oramus Deum, ut viventium pro nobis preces exaudiat.* Nec enim hoc est per se orare viventes, nisi καταχρηστικῶς: siquidem commendare aliquem alterius precibus, est eum orare, ut pro eo oret. Dixi *per se*: nam ex adjunctis fieri potest, ut sit æquivalenter Orare viventes si videlicet alios oravimus ut pro nobis orent, & deinde Deum oremus, eorum preces exaudiat. Sic Collecta de sancto Antonio v. c. in Missali: *Intercessio nos quæsumus Domine B. Antonii Abbatis commendet, ut quod nostris meritis non valemus, ejus patrocinio assequamur. Per Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum.* Hæc inquam collecta invocationem B. Antonii continet ex mente Ecclesiæ, quæ in Litaniis suis ait: *Sancte Antoni ora pro nobis.*

SECTIO XXI.

Vindicantur Augustinus, aliisque Patres, & Peronius à calumniis D. Morlæi.

D. Morlæus p. 59. *Hæc sufficiunt ad vindicandum non tantum Augustinum, sed etiam reliquos omnes Patres quarti sæculi (exceptis tribus aut quatuor) ab illâ infamiâ notâ, quam illis inurere conantur Pontificii, dum illos pro hodiernâ Ecclesiæ Romanæ Idololatriâ, testimonium, velint, nolint, cogunt dicere. Et profectò si non omnem exuissent frontem omnem Augustini præcipuè mentionem*

tionem hac in causâ omisissent, quem probè norunt Invocationem Sanctorum adeò non probasse, ut non modo rem ipsam disertis verbis neget; sed ipsa hujus tam prava superstitionis fundamenta convellat. Nam non negabunt Pontificii fundamentum Invocationis Sanctorum, esse persuasionem, quod Sancti defuncti rebus humanis interfint, preces eorum audiant, & ea, quæ petuntur intelligant. At Augustinus contraria omnia sensit.

Resp. Ad contumeliosa verba, *Infamia notam, Idololatriam, frontem exutam, pravam superstitionem*, & id genus orationis tuæ ornamenta non recurreres, nisi deficiente ratione ad fidem faciendam idoneâ, populo imponere speraſſes, hac agresti ferociâ. Quæ probra jacis, honestiùs à nobis audiuntur, quam à te dicuntur. Utinam tui Symmistæ frontem retinuissent sinceram, teneram, probitatis indicem, & testem: nec tot schismatibus Ecclesiam divisissent, nec tot erroribus fædassent, nec tot hæresibus animas Christi sanguine redemptas infecissent, lugentibus bonis, ridentibus malis, jubilantibus dæmoniis, viam per eos ad Libertinismum, & Atheismum aperiri & sterni gaudentibus. Quando ostenderis ubi illa diserta Augustini verba reperiamur, quid respondendum sit videbimus: nam velle ut decem, imò duodecim vegrandia volumina percurramus, ad invenienda verba, quæ fortè nusquam extant, & Calvinianâ fide citantur, nimis inhumanum imperium est. Interea asseveroAugustinum sententiæCatholicæ fundamenta nunquam evertisse: scire Sanctos ea, quæ hic aguntur, asserit, licet de medio illius cognitionis nihil certi definiat. Fieri posse docet per Mortuos, per Angelos, per Dei revelationem, qui Prophetis multa & loco dissita, & tempore futura revelavit. Nos nostris rebus interesse posse, sicut Samuel vivo Sauli adfuit, eique futuram cladem prædixit: & Paulus vivus Beatorum agmina vidit. Vide libri de Curâ pro Mort. c.xv. Vide, an non frontem tuam requirere debeamus (si flosculum aliquem exhorto tuo decerpere nobis liceat & orationi nostræ inserere) qui tam asseveranter ais Augustinum negasse Beatis rerum, quæ hic aguntur, cognitionem.

D. Morlæus p. 62. *Augustinus l. II. contra Parmenianum cap. VIII, citatis ex I. Ioan. II. verbis*: Si quis peccaverit, advocatum habemus apud

apud Patrem, Jesum Christum justum, ait: *Si diceres mediatorem me habetis, apud Patrem, & ego exoro pro peccatis vestris. quis eum ferret bonorum, & fidelium Christianorum? Quis sicut Apostolum Christi; & non sicut Antichristum metueret? Homines enim omnes Christiani invicem se commendant orationibus suis; pro quo autem nullus interpellat; sed ipse pro omnibus, hic unus, verusque Mediator est*, & addis: *Hic sermo est, de Mediatore non Redemptionis; sed Intercessionis. Et probat unum solumque esse ejusmodi Mediatorem ex Ioanne*, &c.

Resp. S. Augustinus satis eo loco explicat, de quali *Mediatore* loquatur de eo scilicet, *qui pro omnibus omnino interpellat, & pro ipso nemo.* Quo sensu fatemur solum Christum dici posse *Mediatorem.* At verò cum hoc stat, & quod alii pro invicem orare possint (dicit enim expressè *omnes Christianos invicem se commendare orationibus suis.*) Et quod alios ad illud Charitatis officium invitare possint, etiam mortuos. An verò alius seu vivus, sive mortuus Deum pro nobis interpellans *Mediator* dici possit, necne? Quæstio est de voce ob quam Ecclesiæ membra impiè divellemur. Agnosce Sanctos pro nobis orare: & nos illorum preces utiliter petere; & hic pax erit, tametsi illâ voce abstineas.

D. Morl. p. 63. *Cardinalis Peronius Casau-bono dixit, se nunquam in omni vitâ suâ (præterquam cum in publicis processionibus succlamaret cum cæteris: Ora pro nobis) aliquem sanctorum invocasse. Quod de Peronio Casau-bonus vir fide dignus refert, & ex ipso Andreæ vir fide dignissimus. Quâ conscientiâ rem, quam putabat utilissimam neglexit? aut quâ fide rem, quam putabat inutilem, tam acriter defendit, & aliis, tanquam rem utilissimam prædicat, & commendat?*

Resp. Hæc asseris ex aliis, illis *fide dignior*, ut ad faciendam fidem in tribus testibus, tres habeamus gradus comparitionis, si tamen tres dici possint, cum duorum assertio Casau-boni testimonio nitatur, adeoque tres isti unus tantum testis sint ut ex utroque Jure constat. Sed quia ita vis, sint tres. Res est facti, & quæ pendet à testimonio trium & Peronii, & Ecclesiæ inimicorum. Quis verò trium à fide divinâ alienorum fidem humanam præstabit? Qui Patrum scripta & ipsa Dei verba, quæ manent, & fraudem vestram redarguunt, & vim sibi illatam

tam ostendunt, torquetis, ut quæ vultis deponant: majori sinceritate dicta transeuntia modernorum, ubi falsitas nullâ ratione detegi potest, tractabitis? Credat Judæus Apella. Certè hoc malam fidem Casauboni demonstrat, quod Peronius & sacra more Catholico fecerit, & Ecclesiasticum recitarit officium: in utroque enim Sancti invocantur. Adeoque Sanctos invocavit Peronius extra supplicationes publicas.

Verum, ut videas, quam æqui tibi sumus, damus ultrò quod assumis: admittimus Peronium non orasse Sanctos. Petis: quâ conscientiâ rem utilem omisit? Aut quâ fide rem inutilem commendavit? Respondeo: multa utilia, imo utilissima omitti posse sine peccato, si nullâ lege divinâ, aut humanâ imperentur. Consilia Euangelica utilissima sunt; nemo tamen illius utilitatis causâ ad illa tenetur; sed illa aut servat, aut non servat pro libitu nisi ex voto ultronee, aut Ecclesiæ præcepto, aut aliunde nascatur obligatio. Ecclesia porrò singulis non imperat, ut Sanctos invocent: potest quisque suas preces rectà ad Deum deferre *per Iesum Christum Dominum nostrum* licet cuique Laico, omissâ salutatione Angelicâ, Litaniisque majoribus & Minoribus, Orationem Dominicam, Symbolum Apostolorum, &c. totâ vitâ suâ recitare. Exigit tantum Ecclesia credat quisque *Sanctos cum Deo regnantes honorandos, & invocandos esse*; nusquam cuique imperat, ut eos invocet: vetat, ne quis eos invocandi morem tam pium, tam antiquum damnet. Damnant autem Calvini gregales, & quidem gravissimi criminis, nimirum Idololatriæ. Vides, si demus quod petis, Cardinalem Peronium nonnisi in publicis Ecclesiæ precibus Sanctos invocasse, eum & salvâ conscientiâ omittere potuisse rem utilissimam, & salvâ fide eandem commendare. Sed tamen historia conficta est, ut vidimus, à Casau-bono.

Pag. 64. & 65. recoctam Cramben. adfers. Ais: Sanctorum pro nobis Intercessionem creditam ad annum CCL. Eorum Invocationem circa annum CCCLXX. Prioris sententiæ Auctorem fuisse Origenem: Posterioris verò Rhetores. His sese opposuisse clarissimos viros, *Epiphanium, Augustinum, Ambrosium, Hieronymum, Chrysostomum, Theodoretum.*

Hinc non ante sextum sæculum obtinuisse, infers, Sanctorum Invocationem, quando S. Gregorius Magnus Litanias instituit.

Resp. Mera Vigilantis, miraque somnia! Quis ista probavit? quis non probanti credet? *Quid in Deum fide, in homines verecundiâ, aut tecum ipso, constantiâ*, hoc dicis? ut verba tua tibi remittam, in quem optimè conveniunt. Inverecundo commento, splendido mendacio, unum deest, scilicet, ut asseras Vigilantium & Faustum Manichæum Sanctorum & venerationem, & invocationem probasse & docuisse: & eam ob rem fuisse unum à B. Hieronymo, alterum ab Augustino impugnatos. Ex operibus ejusmodi quis cor tuum obsideat, satis apparet: nec enimverò nisi Calvini spiritu animareris, hæc commentus unquam fuisses.

SECTIO XXII.

Vendicatur Ecclesiæ praxis à calumniis D. Morlæi.

D. Morlæus p. 65. *Quantumvis inter disputandum dicant Pontificii se Sanctos invocando, nihil aliud intelligere, quam ut Sancti pro illis Deum orarent* (pro orent) *tamen ex usu communi, & precum formulis & picturis, & Imaginibus, palam est, quod aliam in sinu fovent opinionem, quod Sancti invocentur non ut intercessores tantum; sed ut Largitores bonorum omnium.* Et profers aliqua verba ex Gabriele Biel, & B. Bernardino.

Resp. Inverecunda accusatio est tam fædam hyprocisim Ecclesiæ Catholicæ objicere, vestrum nempe crimen, & eorum qui cum veritate luctantur, eamque ejurant. Apologias hac in re non modo scribimus, sed & vivimus. Nec enim solum Ecclesiæ in Concilio collectæ decreta; verum etiam ejusdem per totum orbem diffusæ communis usus, & solemnes precum formulæ cum in Missali, tum in Breviario, mendacem Accusationem puram putamque Sycophantiam demonstrant. Ad alias preces, si quæ alibi fortassis occurrunt, & ex his non sint extractæ; sed solâ cujuspiam privatæ personæ solitariâ Devotione formatæ, nemo nisi litium amans recurret: quia non magis

gis tenetur Ecclesia privatorum quorumque preces, quam facta præstare. Iniquissimum verò erit ex illis, de Ecclesiæ mente ferre judicium, ubi illæ minus cum Ecclesiæ decretis conveniunt. Tamersi nihil in privatis illis libellis inveniri, credam, quod non commodè explicetur, si benignum interpretem, & non malignum calumniatorem, aut malevolum reprehensorem inveniat. Certè cum neminem obligent illæ preces, quales quales sint, nemini justam aut ipsam Ecclesiam calumniandi, aut ab ejus communione secedendi occasionem facere possunt. Idem dictum puta de iis, quæ ex Bernardino, & Gabriele citasti; quæ bonum sensum admittere, mox patebit.

D. Morleus p. 66. *Vidi in monasterio Franciscanorum Antverpiæ, & Brugis tabellam in quâ Christus pingitur iratus, fulmen vibrans, quo de miseris mortalibus pœnas sumeret, nisi Mater Virgo, Dominici, & Francisci precibus exorata, furoris impetum in ipso impetu sisteret. Quâ admonentur homines, Mariam, potius quam Christum invocandam esse, utpote quæ peccatoribus indulgentior, & ad miseris succurrendum promptior sit, quam ipse Christus.*

Resp. salvâ sacrarum Litterarum auctoritate negari non potest, Deum hominum aliquorum sibi gratorum intercessione placatum, iram posuisse ob mortalium peccata justissimè conceptam, & vindictam, quam de iis jam jam sumpturus erat aut remisisse planè, aut certè distulisse. Inter præcipua Dei Attributa Misericordia recensetur, recensetur & Justitia, utraque, sicut & ipse Deus, Infinita: ita tamen ut Misericordia superemineat, quia *super exaltat Misericordia judicium*, Jacobi II, 13. Et *Miserationes ejus super omnia opera ejus*. CXLIV. 9. Subinde tamen multiplicatis sine fine hominum peccatis vindictam celerem exigentibus, Justitia ad sumendam pœnam armata, piorum hominum interventu exarmatur. Et hoc ipsum Misericordiæ Divinæ est, hominum bonorum pro aliis intercessionem admittere, imò & quærere, & ubi non inveniuntur, qui intercedant, veluti dolere, & conqueri. Ezechielis XIII, 3. *Non ascendistis ex adverso, nec opposuistis murum pro domo Israël, ut staretis in prælio in die Domini.* Hæc doctrina Catholica

tholica est, quâ stante, nihil est in picturâ Brugensi reprehensione dignum. Sed ei similem exhibet sacra historia nam.

Exodi XXXII, 10. ait Deus ipse Moysi: *Dimitte me, ut irascatur furor meus contra eos*, Israëlitas, *& deleam eos*. Sed Moyses Deum oravit, adhibitis etiam Intercessoribus *Abraham, Isaac*, & *Iacob*, ut populo suo parceret, & exauditus est: additur enim Versu 14. *Placatusque est Dominus ne faceret malum, quod locutus fuerat adversus populum suum.* Hæc sacra Scriptura. Quid est in imagine illâ vel Brugensi, vel Antverpianâ, quod sacer textus hic non exhibeat? Deus utrobique videtur iratus, homines peccatores delere paratus. Utrobique interveniunt Beatæ animæ, illic Abraham, Isaac, & Jacob, hic verò Beata Dei Genitrix. Utrobique ad illud Charitatis officium viventium piorum precibus excitantur, illic *Moysis*, hic *Dominici*, & *Francisci*. Vtrobique par exitus, illic Deus placatus dicitur, ne faceret malum; hic deposito fulmine Dei manum exarmatam fuisse pingitur. Deest utrobique *Admonitio*, quam tu de tuo tabellæ addendam finxisti: quamque pari jure historiæ addere potuisses. Hæc ad imagines illas à tuis calumniis vindicandas abundè sufficiunt. Amplius adhuc aliquid ex sacris Litteris didicimus, non solùm Deum, cum irasceretur, piorum precibus placatum fuisse ne malum infligeret; sed etiam dum actu sævit & pœnas sumebat, eorundem interventu quievisse. Numer. XVI. 46. & 47. *Egressa est ira Domini, & plaga desævit. Cum Aaron cucurrisset ad mediam multitudinem, quam jam vastabat incendium, obtulit Thymiama, & stans inter mortuos, & viventes, pro populo deprecatus est, & plaga cessavit.* Hæc S. Scriptura: cui nihil par habet Imago Brugensis, aut Antuerpiana, quæ tanto tibi scandalo fuerunt, homini nimirum scrupuloso, & de Dei honore solicito!

Dixi Misericordiæ esse, quod Deus hominum piorum pro impiis intercessionem admittere dignatur. Vnde consummatæ, & (sit venia verbo) implacabilis iræ indicium fuit, quod dixerit Hieremiæ VII. 16. *Ne assumas pro eis orationem, & laudem, & non resistas mihi, quia non exaudiam te*: Quibus verbis satis indicat, aliàs fuisse & exaudi-

tum

tum, & exaudiendum. Vide Hieremiæ xv. 1, & Ezech. xiv, 20.

D. Morlæus p. 66, *Dolendum est, quod hiis impiis fraudibus cor Christianorum à Deo, & Christo, alienatur, & omnis ferè Devotio à Deo ad Sanctos, à Christo ad Mariam transfertur. Adeo ut quemadmodum Athanasius olim dixit, mirari orbem Christianum se factum Arrianum, sic orbis Romanus mirari possit, se factum Marianum. Sunt enim hi, qui se dicunt Catholicos, revera Mariani, potius quam Christiani.*

Respondeo: utrum *Athanasii* sint illa verba, ut tu pro tuâ in rebus Theologicis peritiâ dicis, an *Hieronymi*, quod res est (hic enim dialogo contra Luciferianos ait: *Ingemuit totus orbis, & Arrianum se esse miratus est.*) Non magni momenti quæstionem arbitror. Minùs *Mariani* nomen horreo, quam aut *Calvinistæ*, aut *Zuingliani*, aut etiam *Ariani*, sive *Manichæi*. Mariæ cum Christo, matri cum filio, Dei Genitrici cum Deo incarnato optimè convenit: Vnde Mariæ, veluti personæ super omnes puras creaturas summè dilectæ, adhærendo, nunquam à Christo discedemus, cui illa inseparabiliter adhærer. Vide an pari certitudine, id de *Vigilantio*, *Aërio*, *Calvino* dicere possis. Frustra proinde Patrinum agis, & nobis invitis, & reclamantibus, nihilque simile meritis nomen imponis, ab omnibus eruditis exsibilandum. Nomina sectæ cujuspiam novæ iis tantum imponuntur, qui à toto se corpore reliquo segregant, schisma conflant, altare contra altare erigunt, hæretica dogmata aut cudunt ipsi nova, aut ab aliis cusa cum pertinaciâ tuentur. Hæc, aut his similia, ubi nos facere videris, Ducis, quem sequemur nomen nobis imponito; quemadmodum nos jure merito *Calvini* nomen vobis imponimus, qui ipso Duce hæc omnia fecistis, nisi quod Altare contra altare non erexistis; sed quantum in vobis fuit omnia evertistis altaria: in quo ipsum Circumcellionum immanissimorum furores superastis. Nos hactenus Deo laus nihil ejusmodi vel mente designavimus: Christi corpori mystico indivulsìm adhæremus, dogmata non cudimus nova, Totum non scidimus, Partem non conflavimus, nec ullum altare contra veterem, & semper probatum in Ecclesiâ morem erexîmus: Fidei Depositum inviolatum custo-

custodimus, & immutatum posteris tradimus, quòd à Patribus veluti manu traditum accepimus, quòd hi ab Apostolis, Apostoli à Christo, Christus à Deo. Vnde & *Christiani* nobis nomen optimè convenit, qui Christo indivisim adhæremus: & *Catholici*, quòd unam sanctam Catholicam, & Apostolicam fidem tueamur, quàm Christi promissione, atque Petræ soliditate corroborati, tuebimur in sæcula.

APPEN-

APPENDIX
DE
IDOLOLATRIA.

PRÆFATIO.

DUo erant, Origene supra laudato teste, capita præcipuè controversa, Christianos inter & Paganos: de Polytheismo unum, aliud de Idolis. De priori jam diximus, quantum sufficere visum est, ad avertendum ab Ecclesiâ Catholicâ cum Ethnicis in re tanti momenti concordiæ crimen, & eluendam maculam illi inhæsuram, ex illâ concordiâ, si daretur. Ostendimus enim nostrum Sanctorum cultum, cum Gentilium Polytheismo nihil habere commune. Superest altera pars de Idolis, eorumque cultu: de quâ Doctissimus D. Morlæus nullam nobis litem movet; eam tamen omittere nolui, tum quia dicunt aliqui ejus symmystæ Idolorum cultum non alium fuisse, quam quem Catholici suis Imaginibus exhibent, tum quia plena de Paganorum Religione notitia, sine Idolorum cognitione haberi non potest. Ex hac verò patebit Imagines nostras immeritò vocari ab antiquis & modernis Iconoclastis *Idola*: earumque cultum nonnisi maligne velut *Idololatricum* infamari.

De Idolis frequens in Sacris litteris mentio; non ita frequens de Hominibus in Deorum album translatis: Vnde constat illa primum in Ethnicorum Theologiâ locum habuisse. Quod confirmatur ex nomine falsorum Deorum cultoribus imposito; *Paganorum* enim nomen recentiùs est, Ethnicis nimirum impositum, vel quòd urbibus exclusi, in Pagis sacra sua facere coacti fuissent, vel quòd vacatio illis fuisset data à militiâ, & muneribus publicis *Ethnicorum*, sive *Gentilium* nomen

illis inditum est, ad distinctionem eorum ab Abrahæ posteris, & illâ Gente, quam Deus inter alias omnes selegit, cui sua judicia, suam voluntatem revelare dignatus est, *cui notus* fuisse *Deus* dicitur à Prophetâ. At verò *Idololatria* nomen est Religionis, quam professi sunt Ethnici, à cultu supremo *Idolorum*, qui *Latria* dicitur, impositum. Hinc Augustinus l. xx, contra Faustum c. xx. *Ad hunc cultum pertinet oblatio sacrificii. Unde Idololatria dicitur eorum, qui hoc* (Sacrificium) *etiam Idolis offerunt.* Enimverò si vel *Polytheismus*, vel *hominum mortuorum cultus* primarium fuisset Catechismi Paganici caput, Ethnici Πολυθεολάτραι, sive Ἑτεροθεολάτραι, sive Ἀνθρωπολάτραι, potius quam Εἰδωλολάτραι, dici debuissent, & ipsa Religio non Εἰδωλολατρεία; sed Ἑτεροθεολατρεία, aut Πολυθεολατρεία, sive Ἀνθρωπολατρεία fuisset appellata.

SECTIO XXIII.

Qui primi Idololatræ?

CAlvinus l. I. Instit. c. XI. S. VIII, asseverat *omnibus ferè à mundo condito sæculis* Idololatriam extitisse. Unde sequitur eam fere fuisse mundo coævam. Cæterùm nec ullâ ratione confirmat hanc suam assertionem, nec ullum Auctorem laudat, unde ea desumatur. Hinc nihil mirum si fidem ei denegemus.

Rabbi Maimonides ait incepisse ab Enos, Sethi filio, Adami nepote: cujus tempore ait *homines erraſſe, & inter errantes fuisse Enos.* Quod probare conatur ex Gen. c. IV. 26. Cæterùm Enos ab eo crimine immunem arbitror: quia loco laudato vulgata dicit: *Iste cœpit invocare nomen Domini.* Et reliquæ versiones omnes in Enosi laudem, potiùs quam vituperium illa verba sumunt. Solum Targum Onkelos peccatum aliquod insinuat: quod tamen potius in Enosi posteris, quam in ipso resedisse indicat. Unde R. Maimonidi nullo modo subscribo: cujus sententia dura, & injusta est, & vix à calumniâ differt, cum ex verbis aut evidenter bonis, aut, quod proximum est, indifferentibus, tantum

tantum crimen elicere voluerit. Quæ verba septuaginta Interpretes sic reddunt: *Speravit invocare nomen Domini Dei nostri*, ἤλπισεν ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ. Quæ verba si ad personam ejus referas, sensum reddunt à Bellarmino traditum, Enos nempe cæteris religiosius coluisse Deum, & quasi Religiosam vitam observasse. Si verò referas ad homines eo tempore viventes, significant eos vel statis diebus solitos feriari, ut uni Deo vacarent: aut etiam certis cujuslibet diei horis, circa Auroram, meridiem, aut vespertina crepuscula, aut etiam quando præcipua opera aggrediebantur, v.c. cibum sumebant, dormitum ibant, è strato surgebant, &c. Perpetuus enim omnium hominum bonorum mos est, semperque fuit, illiusmodi opera à Dei invocatione auspicari. Aliqui ergo per verba illa intelligunt publicas hominum Enosi tempore viventium preces: Bellarminus privatam illius pietatem. Utrique probabilitèr; Nicolaus Liranus, Bellarmino suffragatur, cùm ait: *Enos instructum à Patre suo justo, tantum profecisse in cultu divino, ut adinvenerit verba quædam devota, ad deprecandum Deum.* Hæc ille: quæ tamen cautè legenda, & cum grano salis explicanda sunt: quatenus vim quamdam aliquibus verbis inesse innuit ad placandum Deum. Quod Magicum quid sonat.

Nobiscum Patres sentiunt, quia docent ante diluvium nusquam fuisse Idololatras. Tertul. l. de Idololatriâ, ait Enoch (quem Judas in suâ Canonicâ *septimum ab Adamo* vocat, & diu post Enos vixit) prædixisse, & prædamnasse Idololatriam longè post extituram. Quare sentit necdum notam fuisse Enochi tempore. Idem sentit Cyrillus l. 1. cont. Julianum: Idque colligit, ex eo quod Idololatriam ante Diluvium nullus idoneus Auctor asserit extitisse. Nec etiam ante Turris famosæ ædificationem, eamdem ob causam. At verò paulò post ea semina jacta sunt, quæ copiosam malorum messem protulerunt. Initium mali à *Saruch*, qui fuit Abrahæ Proavus, si fides Suidæ, qui tradit eum, Polytheismum, & Idololatriam in mundum invexisse: cui subscribere malim, quam Constantino Manassi hoc non ipsi Sanuch; sed ejus posteris attribuenti. Enimverò Judith v. 8. refert Achior, Abrahamum *deserviſſe ceremonias Patrum suorum, quæ in multitudine Deorum*

erant, & unum Deum colere cæpisse. Plures ergo majores Abrahæ, & non eorum aliquis unus fuerunt Idololatræ, tres scilicet aut ad minimum duo. Cum ergo Saruch inter, & Abraham, duo tantum intercesserint, *Nachor*, & *Thare*, hic Abrahæ Pater, alter Sarugi filius (ut colligitur ex Luc. III. 34.35.) sequitur Sarug illâ voce plurali fuisse comprehensum. Confirmatur, quia Aug. l. XVI. de Civ. Dei c. XII. docet *Thare* fuisse pium, & unius Dei veri cultorem. De quo vide Salianum ad annum Mundi bis millesimum.

Cum verò duplicem errorem errarint Idololatræ, Idola colendo, & etiam multos Deos, quæri potest, uter error fuerit antiquior? Respondeo: antiquior videtur Polytheismus: atque primùm omnium stellas & admirationi fuisse propter pulchritudinem, & venerationi, propter utilitatem. Hinc Sap. XIII. primò refertur, & refutatur Astrorum Adoratio: deinde Idolorum. Idem sentit R. Maimonides, & Diodorus Siculus l. I. Bibliothecæ. Germanos non alios Deos agnovisse, quam Solem, Lunam, & Vulcanum, testis est Cæsar.

Lucianus lib. de Deâ Syriâ ait Ægyptios omnium Gentium primos fortasse Deorum habuisse notitiam, iis templa statuisse, lucos consecrasse, & solemnes indixisse conventus. Quæ si vera sint, falsi fuerunt; qui vel Sarug, vel Ninum primum Idololatram, Belum verò primam personam Deificatam asseruerunt. Cæterùm tota difficultas solvitur, dicendo, Græcum fuisse Lucianum: ac proindè totam suam doctrinam ab Ægyptiis accepisse: à quibus, teste Diodoro Siculo, suos Græci Deos acceperunt. Vnde nihil mirum ipsos de antiquioribus Diis non cogitasse, quorum nulla in Ægyptiorum Menologio mentio. Sed de his satis.

SE-

SECTIO XXIV.

Quæ fuerint occasiones Idola faciendi?

TRes fuisse Idola faciendi occasiones, antiquorum testimonia probant, quæ sunt. 1. Luctus ob aliquem Charum ereptum. 2. Honor absenti deferendus. 3. Gratus in benè meritum animus. Singula probemus.

Prima causa traditur Sap.XIV.15. *Acerbo luctu dolens Pater, citò sibi rapti filii* (vel *Patris*, addit Salianus) *fecit imaginem & illum, qui tunc quasi homo mortuus fuerat, nunc tanquam Deum colere cœpit: & constituit inter servos suos sacra, & sacrificia.* Infra S.XXIX. dicemus quomodo hoc mæsti Patris qualequale solatium innocens, in omnium criminum maximum degenerarit.

Dicit quidem Patrem superstitem *erepti sibi filii imaginem fecisse*: non negat autem filios Patribus suis similem honorem procurasse. Sic Belum coli curavit Ninus ejus filius, & ditionum hæres. Idem de Sarug dicendum, cum Patri suo statuam erexisse, si vera sit Rabbinorum sententia, dicentium, Aran omnium primum ante Patrem suum obiisse: quod colligunt ex illis sacræ Scripturæ verbis Gen.XI.28. *Mortuusque est Aran ante Thare Patrem suum*: Quod frustra fuisset annotatum, si quod modo passim fit, etiam tunc fieret, ut Patres frequenter filiorum funera ducerent. (Quod intelligi debet, de filiis ante Patres suos morte naturali defunctis: nam si sermo fit de iis etiam qui violentâ morte sublati sunt ante Patres suos, constat Aran non fuisse primum; sed Abel (qui ab homicidâ Cain occisus est) unde sequitur Sarug Patri suo Idolum statuisse, quia nullum filium amisit ipse: nam Aran Abrahæ frater post mortem Sarug vivere desiisse videtur: quia dicit Scriptura ipsum ante Thare Patrem suum mortuum esse; non verò ante Proavum Sarug. Idem fecit Ninus Patri suo Bel, & sine dubio varii alii fecerunt. Videatur Epiphanius Epist. ad Acatium, & Paulum, qui disertè dicit filios Parentibus suis Idola statuisse.

Cur ergo Patris in filium impiam illam pietatem nominat hic sapiens, potiusquam Filii in Patrem? Respondeo, quia amor descendit, & tenerior est Patris in filium & Magistri in Discipulum affectus, quàm è contra. Vnde Patres filiorum suorum mortem veris lacrymis ferè semper lugent; non item filii Patrum: cum exempla non desint eorum, qui ante diem Patrios inquisierint in annos, ut eorum adirent hæreditatem.

Sic ergo Parentes filiis, filii Parentibus primùm sepulchra curarunt, eorum statuis ornata: his deinde superædificarunt Templa: denique sacra & sacrificia constituerunt. Quæ fuit prima & maximè communis Idolorum constituendorum causa, adeò ut à Patribus subinde sola nominetur, quasi unica esset. Minutius Felix: *Sacra facta sunt, quæ fuerant assumpta solatia.* Et Hieronymus l. 1. Comment. in c. 41. Oseæ: *Omnia Idola ex mortuorum errore creverunt.*

Altera causa fuit Reverentia Regibus debita, & obedientiæ futuræ stipulatio, quam posteriora sæcula barbarâ voce, *Homagium* appellant. Sap. XIV. 16. *Interveniente tempore, convalescente iniquâ consuetudine, hic error tanquam Lex custoditus est, & Tyrannorum imperio colebantur figmenta. Et hos, quos in palam homines honorare non poterant, propter hoc, quod longè essent, è longinquo figura eorum allata, evidenter Imaginem Regis, quem honorare volebant, fecerunt; ut illum, qui aberat, tanquam præsentem colerent suâ solicitudine.* Horum Regum statuis initio solus civilis cultus exhibitus est; qui postmodum in sacrum transiit: & licet ex primâ intentione ad supplendum tantummodo præsentiam institutus fuerit, tamen etiam præsentibus erectæ subinde statuæ. Quod Nabuchodonosori factum. Visum etiam id Regibus magis honorificum, dum non ipsi solum; verum etiam Imagines, statuæ, sigilla, vestes, denique quidquid ad eos spectaret peculiari modo, honoraretur. Hinc Imperatorum Romanorum erecta signa, statuæ insuper, venerationi militum expositæ, quoties eis dona distribuebantur.

Civilem illum Imaginum cultum ab alio sacro & separabilem esse, & defacto separatum, liquet, quia Christiani Milites, Apostatæ Juliani statuas honorare non detrectarunt: & hac eorum voluntate simplici

simplici abusus est astutus Apostata, dum cum suis, Deorum Imagines conjunxit, atque in eâdem tabellâ pingi curavit, ut dum suas colerent, Deos falsos unà coluisse viderentur. Prudentiores fraude observatâ cingulum solvere maluerunt, quam civilem cultum Imperatori persolvere, cum Idololatrico conjunctum. Alii simpliciores nihil mali suspicati, & Imperatoris imagines venerati sunt, & eis, ut mos erat, thus adoleverunt. De quo vide Theodoretum l. III. hist. c. XVI. Sozomenum & Nazianzenum Invect. I. in Julianum, pag LXXXV. & sequentibus, ubi refert, quam nobili Fidei suæ confessione, cum perfidiæ Impiissimi Apostatæ detestatione maculam sibi inustam eluerint, Christiani milites.

Ubi nota, quod quando solus cultus civilis exhibebatur, cum unà cum Rege, cui debebatur, interiisse: sic conjux à lege Viri teste Apostolo, subditi ab obedientiâ Regi suo debitâ, cujusque morte liberantur. Secus, ubi in sacrum, atque Religiosum transivit, quia ipsorum Sacerdotes, aliique Ministri adeò non extingui permittebant, ut etiam augere conarentur, quasi aucta foret ipsâ ex hoc mundo translatione Numinis Potestas, cum humanis exemptum, cælo sideribusque donatum esset, & major esset è longinquo Majestas. Hinc factum credo, ut præter communes cunctis Idololatris Græcorum Deos, Jovem, dico, Neptunum, Plutonem, variæ gentes suos nactæ sint. Sic in Oriente Bel, in Syriâ Adad, & Azael, ut ait Josephus l. IX. Antiq. Jud. c. II. In Ægypto Osyris, Isis, Serapis, Apis, Saturnus, Janus, Romulus, sive Quirinus, & Flora, Romæ, Trojæ, Hector, Delphis Apollo, in Chio Aristæus, in Samo Lisander, in Siciliâ Niobe Narriæ Viridianus, Ascoli Ancaria, Volsinii Nertia, Sutrini Nutria, alii alibi. Enimverò tametsi de singulis dicere non possimus, quo modo eorum cultus aut primùm introductus, aut postea propagatus ad posteros fuerit, is tamen quem diximus maximè verosimilis visus est.

Tertia causa statuas erigendi fuit gratus in benè de se, deque humano genere, sive de Patriâ meritos animus. Videtur quasi omnibus à naturâ insita quædam inclinatio erectâ in honorem Benefactoris, & Beneficii memoriam statuâ, Beneficium acceptum aut compensare,

aut

aut saltem agnoscere. Luculentiora optari non possunt testimonia, quam ex foris Romanis, & Atheniensibus, in quibus tot erectæ, tum pedestres, tum equestres statuæ. Similem ob causam Syrophænissa Christo Domino statuam æneam posuit, ut ait Sozomenus lib. v. hist. c. xx. Metaphrastes, & Nicephorus: quam Julianus confringi curavit, & suam ipsius in alterius locum substitui. Verum Juliani statua de cælo tacta circa pectus dissecta, & disjecta, fuit.

SECTIO XXV.

Pagani Idola sua Deos esse crediderunt, quia eos Deos vocârunt.

PRima ratio, quâ veritatem hanc probamus, in quâ totius controversiæ cardo vertitur, est, quia vocantur disertè Dii. Quod ex sacris Litteris, Paganorum confessione, sanctisque Patribus, qui cum Paganis vixerunt, & Fidei Christianæ veritatem, eversâ Paganorum impiâ superstitione, & linguâ, & calamo propugnarunt, & confirmarunt & stabilierunt. Nulli videntur assignabilia certiora veritatis in re antiquâ. & pridem antiquatâ inveniendâ principia: ad quæ recurremus in sequentibus, & ex iis, quæ dicturi sumus hauriemus.

Ex sacris quidem litteris constat Idola Deos vocata esse. 1. cum Jacob è Soceri sui Laban domo aufugeret, ut ad patrem rediret, Rachel ipso inscio Patris sui Idola clam abstulit. Quod facinus Laban Jacobo exprobrans, Gen. xxxi. 30. ait: *Quare furatus es Deos meos?* Et ver. 32. respondet Jacob: *Apud quemcumque inveneris Deos tuos, necetur coram fratribus nostris. Hæc dicens, ignorabat quod Rachel furata esset Idola.* Hæc ibi: ubi & Idololatra Laban Socer Idola sua Deos appellat: & Fidelis Jacob Gener Deorum audito nomine Idola intellexit.

2. Gen. xxxv. 2. *Abiicite Deos alienos, qui in medio vestri sunt.* Et versu 4. *Dederunt ergo ei omnes Deos alienos, quos habebant. At ille*, Jacob, *infodit ea subter terebinthum, quæ est post urbem Sichem.* Quidnam Jacobi familiares

res atque Domestici potuerunt illi *dare*, aut hic *infodere subter terebinthum*, præter Idola? Dicitur tamen & illos ei dedisse Deos, & hunc Deos infodisse. Idola proinde & vocabantur, & censebantur Dii.

3. Exodi XXXII. 4. Israelitæ dixerunt: *Hi sunt Dii tui, Israel, qui te eduxerunt de terrâ Ægypti*; cum de Vitulo recens ab Aarone conflato loquerentur: cui, Vitulo, Aaron idem altare sacravit, solemni cultu sacrificium obtulit, & festum diem ei colendo indixit.

4. Judicum XVII. 5. *Michas ædiculam in domo suâ, Deo separavit, & fecit Ephod, & Theraphim, & Idola.* Deo separasse, id est, consecrasse dicitur ædiculam, qui Idolo, à se facto sacellum aliquod ad ejus venerationem destinavit. Deinde ejusdem libri c. XVIII. 24. cum Michæ à Danitis ablatum fuisset Idolum, jacturam illam Idoli, his verbis deplorat: *Deos meos, quos feci mihi, tulistis.*

5. Sap. XIV. 21. *Aut affectui, aut Regibus deservientes homines, incommunicabile nomen lapidibus, & lignis imposuerunt.* Scilicet, quia Dei nomen statuis lapideis, ligneisque imposuerant homines; quod nomen *incommunicabile* dicitur, ob singularitatem naturæ Divinæ per illud significatæ. Et cap. XV. 15. ejusdem operis dicitur: *Omnia Idola Nationum Deos æstimaverunt.*

6. Dan. XIV. 5. v. 6. Rex Babylonis Danieli, Deum ipsius mortuum esse exprobranti, ait: *Non videtur tibi Bel esse vivens Deus. Annon vides quanta comedat, & bibat quotidie? Et ait Daniel arridens: Ne erres, Rex, iste enim* (nempe Bel) *intrinsecùs luteus est, & forinsecùs æneus: neque comedit aliquando.* Ex quibus verbis patet de ipsâ statuâ sermonem fuisse, cui singulis diebus cibi apponebantur, quos Rex ab ipsâ statuâ consumi solere, indeque eam vivere deducebat. Cujus errorem redarguit Daniel: qui refertur etiam in consequentibus Sacerdotum Idololatrarum fraudem detexisse, qui cibos illos consumebant, Idolo oblatos.

Secundum Testium agmen ex Paganis idem attestantibus constat. Lucianus in Dialogo, cui titulus *Iupiter Tragædus*, cum retulisset Mercurium Jovis nomine Deos omnes in Concilium convocasse, hæc velut à Jove dicta refert: *Iam plenis viis conveniunt*, nempe Dii. *Quapropter*, O Mercuri, *assumens illos in sedes colloca, pro suâ quemque dignitate.*

Priores quidem sedes occupent Aurei post hos locentur Argentei: Deinceps verò subsequantur quotquot sunt Elephantini: his posteriùs succedant Ænei, atque Lapidei. Verum in his etiam ipsis Phidiæ, aut Alcamenis, aut Mironis, aut Euphranoris, aut talium Artificum gratia præhonoretur. Cæterum vulgares illi nullâ arte nobiles, longè alicubi conclusi in angulum locentur cum silentio, complentes tantùm concionem. Dubitat exinde Mercurius, quâ ratione de Deorum meritis judicare possit, cum inter Aureos aliqui essent valdè ponderosi, leviores alii. Aliud etiam incommodum ex eâ Sedium distributione consecuturum ait, quod Dii Barbari præsiderent, Græcis postpositis, cum hi ut plurimùm tantum essent Lapidei, aliorum verò multi Aurei: cum tamen Græcis Diis ob Artis excellentiam præstantior locus deberetur. Alia difficultas subinde nata, de Colosso Rhodio, qui licet Æneus tantum esset, ob magnitudinem tamen, & Æris copiam, majoris esset precii, quam ipsi Dii Aurei: Cum tamen iste præ magnitudine in Scamnis aliis præparatis sedere non posset, jussus est in medio consistere. Hæc & id genus alia non pauca, explicari quî possunt, nisi Idola Dii censerentur?

Deinde Jamblichus apud Photium in Bibliothecâ Cod. ccxv. docet Idola divina esse, sive cælo delapsa sint, sive hominum manu arteque fabricentur: omniaque naturam excedere. Quem eam ob causam Philoponus impugnavit: ut ibidem traditur.

Plato ab Eusebio l. XIII. de Præpar. Euangel. c. VIII. dicitur simulachris, quæ manibus hominum fiunt, & ad eorum similitudinem formata sunt, Dei appellationem turpiter attribuisse. His plura addemus è Paganorum operibus desumpta testimonia, obiter inferiùs.

Huic etiam Veritati Patres attestantur. 1. sit Justinus M. Epist. ad Diognetum. *Vide non solum oculis; sed etiam Prudentiâ*, inquit, *cujus sunt subsistentiæ, aut cujus formæ ii, quos vocatis, & existimatis Deos. Nonne eorum alius est Lapis, ei, qui calcatur, similis? alius autem est æs, nihilo melius, quam quæ in usum nostrum fabricata sunt vasa? alius lignum, & quidem etiam putridum? alius argentum, cui opus est homine custodituro, ne furto auferatur? alius ferrum rubigine corrupeum: alius testa, nihilo speciosior eâ, quæ ad abjectissimum ministerium facta est? Nonne ex materiâ corruptioni obnoxiâ sunt hæc omnia? nonne*

nonne ferri, & ignis ope fabricata? nonne eorum aliud sculptor Lapidum, aliud Faber ærarius, aliud faber argentarius, aliud figulus finxit? Minimeque in talem formam unumquodque mutatum erat, priusquam arte alicujus horum hæc impressa ei fuisset? Nonne quæ nunc eâdem è materia sunt vasa, similia his reddi possunt, si eosdem artifices nanciscantur? Nonne hæc quæ à vobis adorantur, ab hominibus vasa reliquis similia fieri rursum possint? Nonne surda sunt omnia? Nonne cæca? Nonne inanima? Nonne sensus omnis expertia? Nonne immobilia? Nonne omnia putrescunt? Nonne omnia corrumpuntur? HÆC DEOS VOCATIS, *his servitis, hæc adoratis, & omnino similes istis reddimini. Idcirco sunt vobis odio Christiani, quoniam hos esse Deos non arbitrantur.* Hæc Justinus M.

Consonat Tertullianus Apolog. c. XII. *De simulachris ipsis,* inquit, *nihil aliud deprehendo, quam materias sorores esse vasculorum communium, vel ex ipsis vasculis: quasi fatum consecratione mutantes, licentiâ artis transfigurante, in ipso opere sacrilegè: Vt revera nobis maximè, qui propter Deos ipsos plectimur, solatium panarum esse possit, quod eadem & ipsi patiantur, ut fiant. Crucibus, & stipitibus imponitis Christianos: quod simulachrum non prius argilla deformat Cruci, & stipiti superstructa? In patibulo primum corpus Dei vestri dedolatur. Vngulis deraditis latera Christianorum: at in Deos vestros validiùs incumbunt asciæ, & runcinæ, & scobinæ. Cervices ponimus ante plumbum, & glutinum, & gomphos: Sine capite sunt Dii vestri. Ad bestias impellimur, certè quæ Libero, & Cibele, & Cereri applicatis. Ignibus urimur, hoc & illi à primâ quidem massâ. In metalla damnamur: inde censentur Dii vestri. In Insulis relegamur: Solet & in Insulis aliquis Deus vester aut nasci, aut mori. Si per hæc constat Divinitas aliqua, ergo qui puniuntur, consecrantur, & numina erunt dicenda supplicia. Sed planè non sentiunt has injurias, & contumelias suæ fabricationis Dii vestri, sicut nec obsequia, &c.*

Item ejusdem operis c. XXV. *Nisi fallor,* inquit, *omne regnum, vel imperium bellis quæritur, & Victoriis propagatur. Porrò bella, & Victoriæ, captis & eversis plurimùm urbibus constant: id negotium sine Deorum injuriâ non est: Cædes, & strages mænium, & templorum, pares cædes Civium, & Sacerdotum, nec dissimiles rapinæ sacrarum divitiarum, & prophanarum. Tot igitur Sacrilegia Romanorum, quot Trophæa: tot de Diis, quot de gentibus triumphi: tot manubiæ, quot manent adhuc simulachra captivorum Deorum. Et ab hostibus ergo*

suis sustinent adorari, & illis imperium sine fine decernunt, quorum magis injurias, quam Adulationes, remunerasse debuerunt. Sed qui nihil sentiunt, tam impunè laduntur, quam frustra coluntur.

Deinde ibidem cap. XL. *Si quid adversi accidit, Vrbibus, eadem clades Templorum, quæ & murorum fuerunt: ut jam hoc revincam, non à Diis evenire, quia & ipsis evênit.*

Denique lib. de Resur. Carnis c. VI. *Phydiæ manus Iovem Olympium ex Ebore molitur, & Adoratur: nec jam bestia, & quidem insulsissima dens est; sed summum sæculi numen: non quia Elephas; sed quia Phidias tantus. Vt honestiùs homo Deum, quam Deus hominem finxerit.*

Cyprianus l. de exhortat. Martyrii c. I. ex professo probat: *Quod Idola Dii non sint.*

Hier. l. altero Comment. in Mat. XV. Idololatras ait: *Ignorasse Deum, & adorasse Lapidem.*

Legantur quæ habet B. Ambrosius l. II. de Virginibus, non procul à fine: veritatem hîc traditam evidenter confirmant.

Augustinus l. I. de consensu Euang. c. XXVII. *Quærunt Pagani, ubi Deos suos intrudant, ne à Christianis inveniantur, & confringantur.*

Quod B. Augustinus paucis verbis complexus est, pluribus exponit Theodoretus lib. X. de Curandis Græcorum affect. pag. DCXXXIV. *Si fateri ipsi non vultis*, inquit, *at omnibus constat, qui Deos terrâ obrutos sæpenumero suis oculis viderunt, indeque ab iis, qui Pietatem didicerant, erutos, & in lucem prolatos. Alii enim dæmonum cultui mancipati defoderunt, Diis opem ferre se arbitrantes: alii talia quærentibus, ubi laterent indicarunt. Hi verò inventos, erutosque publicè spectandos proposuerunt, ut mulierculis, adolescentulisque ludibrio essent, qui Dii vocabantur. Erant enim partim reptilium, partim quadrupedum simulachra, etiam vespertilionum, & inurium imagines adorabant. Cumque animalia ipsa, serpentes, inquam, & scorpiones, & mures vespertilionesque interficerent, eorum tamen simulachra ut Deos colebant.* Hæc Theodoretus.

Arnobius lib. VI. contra Gentes. *Simulachra ista, quæ vos terrent*, inquit, *quæque Templis in omnibus prostrati, atque humiles adoratis, ossa, lapides, æra sunt, argentum, aurum, testa, lignum sumptum ex arbore, aut commixtum*

gluti-

glutinum gypso: ex ornatibus fortasse meretriciis, aut ex muliebri mundo. Iste non error est, non, ut propriè dicatur, amentia, Deum credere, quem tute ipse formaris: supplicare trembundum fabricata abs te rei: & cum scias, & certus sis, tui operis & digitorum artem, pronum in faciem ruere, opem rogare supplicitèr, adversisque in rebus, atque in temporibus asperis, propitiis numinis favorem succurrere, &c. Hæc Arnobius.

Eusebius lib. IX. hist. Eccles. c. VI. orationem refert Luciani Presbyteri, Fidei suæ & Conversionis à Paganismo rationem reddentis, in quâ hęc habet: *Fateor, erravimus etiam nos aliquando; & simulachra, quæ ipsi finximus, Deos Cæli, & Terræ putabamus Auctores. Sed arguebat eos fragilis substantiæ suæ à nobis præstita Consecratio* &c.

Denique Ruffinus lib. II. Hist. (qui ab aliquibus liber XI. Eusebii dicitur) pugnam refert inter Ignem Chaldæorum Deum, & aliarum Gentium Deos, ex metallo, lignove factos: illumque alios omnes vicisse, ligneos comburendo, metallinos verò liquefaciendo atque conflando. Eum tamen victum à Canopo Ægyptiorum Deo, cujus Caput Vase ex Argillâ magno aquâ pleno, foraminibus cerâ clausis imposuerunt ejus Sacerdotes. Cum enim liquefactâ cerâ, aqua diffluereret, ignem à Chaldæis adoratum extinxit. Unde colligitur Chaldæos quidem Ignem adorasse, reliquas verò in circuitu Gentes coluisse simulachra.

Hinc patet meritò dictum Sap. XV. 17. *Meliorem esse hominem opificem iis, quos colit: cum ille vixerit aliquando; isti verò nunquam.*

SECTIO XXVI.

Pagani Deos coluerunt ab hominibus factos.

HÆc secunda est ratio, quâ primariam propositionem probamus: Nec enim verum esse potuit, Paganos opera manuum suarum coluisse, scilicet supremo cultu, soli Deo debito, nisi Idola Deos existimassent. Coluisse porrò Deos hominum manu factos, frequentissimè fuit illis exprobratum, tum in sacris Litteris, tum à sanctis Patribus:

nec minus frequenter ab ipsismet Paganis agnitum. Nam.

1. Exodi XXXII. 1. Israëlitæ dixerunt Aaroni. *Fac nobis Deos, qui nos præcedant.* Cumque factus illâ occasione fuisset vitulus, dixerunt iidem. *Hi sunt Dii tui Israël, qui te eduxerunt de terrâ Ægypti.*

2. Lib. III. Reg. XIV. 9. *Operatus est mala super omnes, qui fuerunt ante te, & fecisti tibi Deos alienos, & conflatiles, ut me ad iracundiam provocares: me autem projecisti post corpus tuum.*

3. Lib. IV. Reg. XVII. 29. *Vnaquæque Gens fabricata est Deum suum; posueruntque eos in fanis excelsis, quæ fecerant Samaritæ, Gens & Gens in urbibus suis, in quibus habitabat,*

4. Isaias II. 8. *Repleta est terra ejus Idolis, opus manuum suarum adoraverunt, quod fecerunt digiti eorum. Et incurvavit se homo,* &c. Et c. XXXVII. 19. cum gloriati fuissent Regis Assyriorum Legati, illum variarum Gentium Deos destruxisse, quatenus Idola comminuerat, id agnoscit Ezechias verum esse. *Dederunt,* inquit, nimirum Assyrii, *Deos eorum igni: non enim erant Dii; sed opera manuum hominum, lignum, & lapis, & comminuerunt eos.*

5. Sapientiæ XIII. 10. *Infelices sunt, & inter mortuos spes illorum est, qui appellaverunt Deos opera manuum hominum, aurum, & argentum, artis inventionem, & similitudines animalium, aut lapidem inutilem, opus manus antiquæ.*

6. Oseæ XIV. 4. Israëlitæ ad Dominum conversi, de præteritis peccatis dolentes, suum benè vivendi propositum his verbis exprimunt: *non dicemus ultrà: Dii nostri, opera manuum nostrarum.*

7. Apocal. IX. 20. *Cæteri homines, qui non sunt occisi in his plagis, neque pœnitentiam egerunt de operibus manuum suarum, ut non adorarent dæmonia, & simulachra aurea, & argentea, & ærea, & lapidea, & lignea,* &c.

8. Prohibentur Dii manu facti. Exod. XX. 23. *Non facietis Deos argenteos, nec Deos aureos facietis vobis.*

9. Pœna indicitur non servantibus Dei mandata, quod essent Diis manufactis serviturî. Deut. IV. 28. *Servietis Diis, qui hominum manu fabricati sunt, ligno, & lapidi, qui non vident, nec audiunt, nec comedunt, nec odorantur.*

De-

10. Denique cum Act. XIX. 26. Demetrius Argentarius seditionem adversus B. Apostolum excitaret, quod Religionem publicam violasset, id unum allegavit, eum ubique docere: *Quod non sunt Dii, qui manibus fiunt.* Credebant ergo illi Deos esse, qui manu fiunt.

11. Audiamus iterum Isaiam c. XLIV. à v. 13. ubi errorem istum stupidissimum refert, eumque solito sibi vigore confutat. *Artifex lignarius extendit normam*, inquit, *formavit illud in runcinâ, fecit illud in angularibus, & in circino tornavit illud, & fecit imaginem viri, quasi speciosum hominem habitantem in domo. Succidit cedros, tulit ilicem, & quercum, quæ steterat inter ligna saltus: plantavit pinum, quam pluvia nutrivit: & facta est hominibus in focum, sumpsit ex eis, & calefactus est; & succendit, & coxit panes: de reliquo autem operatus est Deum, & adoravit, & curvatus est ante illud. Medium ejus combussit igni, & de medio eius carnes comedit: coxit pulmentum & saturatus est, & calefactus est, & dixit: Vah! calefactus sum, vidi focum. Reliquum autem ejus Deum fecit, & sculptile sibi: curvatus est ante illud, & adorat illud, & obsecrat, dicens: Libera me, quia Deus meus es tu.* Hæc de simulachris ligneis, sive sculptilibus.

De Metallinis vero, sive conflatilibus, addit c. XLVI. 5. 6. & 7. *Cui assimilastis me & adæquastis, & comparustis, me, & fecistis similem? Qui confertis aurum de sacculo, & argentum staterâ ponderatis, conducentes aurificem, ut faciat Deum: & procidunt, & adorant. Portant illud in humeris gestantes, & ponentes in loco suo: & stabit, & de loco suo non movebitur.*

12. Idem habet Hieremias, licet obscuriùs, x. 3. *Lignum de saltu præcidit opus manus artificis*, inquit, *in ascia, Argento, & auro decoravit illud, clavis, & malleis compegit, ut non dissolvatur. In similitudinem palmæ fabricata sunt, & non loquentur, portata tolleuntur, quia incedere non valent. Nolite ergo timere eos; quia nec malè possunt facere, nec benè.* Et v. 15. *Vana sunt, & opus risu dignum.* Et cap. XVI. 20. *Numquid faciet sibi homo Deos, & ipsi non sunt Dii?*

Clarius Auctor libri Sap. XIII à VII. *Si quis artifex faber de sylvâ lignum rectum secuerit, & hujus doctè evadat omnem corticem, & arte suâ usus, diligenter fabricet vas utile ad conversationem vitæ, reliquis autem ejus operis ad præparationem escæ abutatur: & reliquum horum, quod ad nullos usus facit,*

lignum

lignum curvum, & vorticibus plenum, sculpat diligenter per vacuitatem suam, & per scientiam suæ artis figuret illud, & assimilet illud imagini hominis, aut alicui ex animalibus illud comparet, perliniens rubricâ, & rubicundum faciens colorem illius, & omnem maculam, quæ in illo est, perliniens. Et faciat ei dignam habitationem, & in pariete ponens illud & confirmans ferro, ne fortè cadat, prospiciens illi, sciens quia non potest adjuvare se.&c. Hæc è sacrâ Scripturâ.

Secunda probatio ducitur ex Paganorum ipsorum confessione. Horatius lib. IV. Carm. Ode VIII. ait

—— Neque tu pessima munerum
Ferres, divite me scilicet artium,
Quas aut Parrhasius protulit, aut Scopas,
Hic saxo, liquidis ille coloribus,
Solers nunc hominem ponere, nunc Deum:
Sed non hæc mihi vis.

Q. d. in statuariâ, aut Picturâ se non adeo excellere, ut Deos formare posset, quod fecerunt nobiles illi sculptores, atque Pictores. Clariùs adhuc l. I. Sat. Satyrâ VIII. ubi hæc habet:

Olim truncus eram ficulnus inutile lignum
Cum faber incertus, scamnum faceretne Priapum,
Maluit esse Deum. Deus inde ego, furum aviumque
Maxima formido.

2. Concinit huic Poëtarum Latinorum omnium judicio Princeps, Virgilius Bucolic. VII. eundem fædissimum Deum alloquens:

Nunc te marmoreum pro tempore fecimus: at tu
Si fœtura gregem suppleverit, aureus esto.

3. Lucianus in Dialogo, cui titulus, *Iupiter Tragœdus*, non solùm idem docet; sed etiam Artifices nominat clarissimos, à quibus Dii celeberrimi facti sunt, v. c. Phidiam, Alcamenem, Euphranorem, aliosque Deum Auctores, quasi diceremus Creatorum Creatores: verba dedimus supra.

4 Mercurius Trismegistus, ut testatur Augustinus lib. VIII. de Civ. Dei, c. XXIII. & XXIV. aliquos Deos ab hominibus factos agnoscit, eos scilicet

scilicet qui in Templis colebantur. Cumque nulli essent, qui non in Templis colerentur, nulli erant præter Idola, & ipsa dæmonia velut unum quid cum Idolis adorabantur.

Tertia probatio desumitur ex Patribus: 1. Origenes lib. 1. contra Cels. pag. VI. *Christiani Deos manufactos*, inquit, *pro Numinibus non habent, cum rationi non sit consentaneum, communia nequam artificum, & plerumque scelestorum opera inter Deos consere.*

2. Justinus M. Apol. II. p. LVIII. *O stuporem è fulmine attonitum! Homines impuros, Deos, qui adorentur, fingere, & transformare, profitemini.*

Tametsi Tertullianum supra dedimus, non pigebit ejus verba iterum exscribere, ex l. de Resur. Carnis. c. VI. *Phidia manus Jovem Olympium ex Ebore, meliorem, & adoratur: nec jam Bestiæ, & quidem insulsissima dens est; sed summum sæculi* NUMEN: *Non quia Elephas; sed quia Phidias tantus.*

Augustinus l. VIII. de Civ. Dei c. XXIII. fusè idipsum probat ex Hermete Trismegisto. Quod paulò superiùs ostendimus.

SECTIO XXVII.

Pagani suis Idolis supplicabant, & in iis spem habebant.

HÆc tertia est ratio, quâ nostra Assertio præcipua confirmatur: cum enim verò suis Idolis supplicaverint, ab iis petierint, quæ desiderabant, spem in iis repositam habuerint, ea sibi eorum virtute præstitum iri, consequens est, credidisse verè Deos esse. Hæc autem assumpta vera esse, patet, nam

Sap. XIII. 17. dicitur, de eo, qui Idolum excuserat: *De substantiâ suâ, & de filiis suis, & de nuptiis votum faciens, inquirit. Non erubescit loqui cum eo, qui sine animâ est: Et pro sanitate quidem infirmum deprecatur, & pro vitâ mortuum rogat, & in adjutorium inutilem invocat: & pro itinere petit ab eo, qui ambulare non potest: & de acquirendo, & de operando, & de omnium rerum eventu petit ab eo, qui in omnibus est inutilis.* Et cap. XIV. *Iterum alius*

navigare cogitàns, & per feros fluctus iter facere incipiens, ligno portante se, fragilius lignum invocat.

Similia sunt, quæ scribit Hieremias in Epist. suâ ad Contribules suos in Babylone captivos (habetur Baruch VI. 40.41.) *Chaldæi*, inquit, *cum audierint mutum non posse loqui, offerunt illum ad Bel, postulantes ab eo loqui: quasi possint sentire, qui non habent motum: & ipsi cum intelleverint, relinquent ea. Sensum enim non habent ipsi Dii illorum.*

Scio quidem utrumq; hoc opus inter Apocrypha recenseri ab iis, quorum causâ hæc scribimus. Adeoq; causaturos non satis ea auctoritatis habere, ad faciendam fidem divinam. Cæterùm in materiâ facti (qualis est, quam tractamus) cur iis fides humana saltem denegetur scire percupio. Scripta sunt ea opera cum totum orbem occuparet Idololatria: atque eum in finem scripta, (saltem Epistola dicta) ut Captivos Judæos adversus dominatricem illam superstitionem armaret, & muniret. At verò incredibile est, argumenta ab Epistolæ scriptore adhibita, quorum falsitas ipsis oculis deprehendi posset: id enim contrarium prorsus effectum habuisset ei, quem intendebat, & potiùs ad Idololatriam amplectendam induxisset, quàm ab eâ quemquam revocasset.

Cæterùm non solum fide Humanâ; verum etiam Divinâ constat ista veritas, cum ex locis laudatis, quæ verè sacra sunt (quidquid in contrarium dicant sive antiqui, sive moderni Hæretici) quia libri, unde desumuntur, sunt in Canonem Scripturæ ab Ecclesiâ recepti: tum etiam quia idem re ipsâ dicit Isaias (de cujus auctoritate Canonicâ nemo dubitat) c. XLIV. 17. *Reliquum ejus*, ligni, *Deum fecit, & sculptile sibi, curvatur ante illud, & adorat illud, & obsecrat, dicens: Libera me, quia Deus meus es tu. Nescierunt, neque intelleverunt; obliti enim sunt, ne videant oculi eorum, & ne intelligant corde suo, non recogitant in mente suâ, neque cognoscunt, neque sentiunt, ut dicant: medietatem ejus combussi igni, & coxi super carbones ejus panes: coxi carnes, & comedi, & de reliquo ejus Idola faciam? Ante truncum ligni procidam? Pars ejus cinis est, & cor insipiens adoravit illud.* Quid habent illa testimonia priora, quod in isto desideretur? stat itaque illorum auctoritas etiam divina, quæ convelli non potest, nisi iste liber convel-

convellatur. Unde dubitari non potest salvâ fide Paganos suis Idolis supplicasse. Quod probandum erat.

Patres huic veritati adstipulantur. Pro aliis loquatur Origenes l. III. contra Cels. pag. CLVII. *Nos certò eos omnes pro ebriis habemus*, inquit, *quotquot statuas sensu carentes, ut numen invocant.* Idem lib. VI. ejusdem operis pag. CCLXXXIV. *Nos eos dicimus ineruditissimos*, inquit, *quos non pudet alloqui res inanimas, & sanitatem petere ab infirmis, vitam à mortuis, opem ab inopibus.* Hæc Origenes.

Nec solum petebant ab Idolis opem; verùm etiam spem in illis collocabant. Hinc Regius vates Psalmo CXIII. 8. *Similes illis* (nempe Idolis) *fiant qui faciunt ea, & omnes qui confidunt in eis.* Erant ergo aliqui Idolorum cultores, qui in iis spem, fiduciamque reponebant, qui opem flagitantes, iis supplicabant, quantumvis *os haberent, nec loquerentur, oculos haberent, nec viderent, aures, nec audirent, nares, nec odorarentur*, &c. quod eleganti inductione exponit Psalmista. Quæ omnia sequens Sectio confirmabit.

SECTIO XXVIII.

Pagani quidquid boni contingebat, suis Idolis acceptum ferebant.

PRæcedenti affinis est ista ratio, quâ probamus Paganos sua Idola veluti vera numina, veros Deos coluisse, quia cuncta bona ab illis proficisci credebant. Hoc ostendimus 1. ex sacris Litteris. Exodi XXXII. 4. Viso vitulo, quem Aaron recens fuderat, Populus exclamat: *Hi sunt Dii tui, Israel, qui te eduxerunt de terrâ Ægypti.* Quæ verba de ipso vitulo, de illâ ipsâ Bovis imagine sive statuâ intelligi, quam erexerat Aaron, & ipse textus clamat, & testatur B. Cyrillus lib. VI. cont. Jul. p. CCCVIII. Mira cæcitas, mera stultitia fuit, fateor, ita sentire, quandoquidem priusquam Aaroni suas detulissent inaures aureas, ex quibus in ignem conjectis conflatus est iste vitulus; jam ex

Ægypto fuerant educti: adeoque suam inde liberationem vitulo adscribere, idem fuit, ac effectum facere causâ suâ priorem etiam tempore: causam verò realiter causare priusquam existat.

2. Pari favitate Hier. 11. 27. à Judæis Idololatris dictum, *Ligno Pascor meus es tu: & Lapidi: tu me genuisti.* Quem errorem confutat c. x. 5. *Portant, nimirum idola, tollentur, quia incedere non valent. Nolite ergo timere eos,* Deos, *quia nec malè possunt facere, nec bene.* Quo argumento planè demonstrativè usus est etiam Isaias c. XLVI. 7. & Baruch c. VI. Et Ambrosius infra crandus.

3. Daniel c. V. 4. ait: *Bibebant* nempè Baltassar cum Aulicis suis, *Vinum & laudabant Deos suos aureos, & argenteos, æreos, ferreos, ligneosque, & lapideos,* scilicet ob Victorias, quas de Judæis, aliisque gentibus retulerant, quas Idolis suis adscribebant. Deinde versu 23. ejusdem capitis Regi stultissimam illam persuasionem exprobrat Propheta: *Deos argenteos,* inquit, *& aureos, & æreos, ferreos, ligneosque, & lapideos, qui non vident, neque audiunt, neque sentiunt laudasti: porrò Deum, qui habet flatum tuum in manu suâ, & omnes vias tuas, non glorificasti.* Hæc Propheta. Utinam aut nulli, aut pauci essent inter Christianos ipsos, qui suæ Industriæ, suæ solertiæ, labori suo, cuncta quæ nacti sunt bona adscribant, pari errore: tametsi sciant certissimè nihil profuturum neque laborem Domum ædificantium, nisi Dominus unâ ædificet, neque vigilantiam custodum, nisi Dominus civitatem custodierit. Psal. CXXVI. Id est, tametsi certò credant perinde inutilem esse operam suam, quantumlibet magnam, ac sensibus ipsis percipere poterant Ethnici inutilia esse sua Idola.

Probatur 2. ex Paganorum confessione Virgilius Bucolicâ VII.

Nunc te marmoreum pro tempore fecimus: at tu,
Si fœtura gregem suppleveris, aureus esto.

Priapum marmoreum, sive marmoream ejus statuam, alloquitur, ab eo petit gregem novo fœtu augeri, proposito præmio aureæ statuæ illi erigendæ, in grati animi testimonium, casu quo grex augeatur: quasi ipsa statua illa marmorea Gregi fœtus largiretur, eosque servaret.

Deinde

Deinde obsessi ab Alexandro Tyrii timentes ne ab Hercule, Tyriorum tutelari numine desererentur, eum, sive ejus statuam catenis vinxerunt. An id, sine fiduciâ in ipsam statuam? Quid sensêre de suo Palladio Trojani? Quid de eodem Græci? nonne utraque gens credidit Trojam, nisi Palladii præsidio destitutam nullâ vi capi posse? Quid de Anciliis suis Romani? Longum esset per cunctas Gentes Latinas, Græcas, Barbaras, discurrere: Nulla extitit Idololatriæ dedita, quæ non singulari cultu Idolum aliquod prosecuta sit, velut in rebus obscuris lumen, in adversis solatium, in asperis lenimen, in prosperis firmamentum, in omnibus Deum malorum Averruncum. Quæ una observatio tantam adducit in medium Testium molem, ut iis fidem negari nullo modo posse videatur:

Probatur 3. ex Patribus, qui cum Idololatris vixerunt: Cyprian. l. ad Demetrianum: *Pudeat te eos colere*, inquit, *quos ipse defendis: pudeat tutelam de iis sperare quos tu ipse tueris.*

Arnobius l. VI. contra Gent. *Iste non error est, non, ut propriè dicatur, amentia? Deum credere, quem tute ipse formaris, supplicare tremebundum fabricatæ abs te rei: ut cum scias, & certus sis tui operis, & digitorum artem, pronum in faciem ruere, opem rogare suppliciter, adversisque in rebus, atque in temporibus asperis, propitii numinis favorem succurrere*, &c.

Ambrosius l. II. de Virginibus ante finem, Dionysii Tyranni, pallium aureum Jovi, Barbam Æsculapio, alia aliis Diis sacrilegè simul & impunè rapientis exemplo, docet nihil nec boni sperari, nec mali timeri posse rationabiliter ab Idolis, quæ Gentium Dii erant.

Augustinus toto ferè eruditissimo opere de Civitate Dei supponit Paganorum errorem, quem referimus, eumque confutat. Data fuit illi occasio opus illud componendi ex clade Romanâ à Gothis illatâ, quam Ethnici Christianis adscribebant, quòd isti Diis Romæ tutelaribus spretis, eorum præsidio spoliassent urbem, quæ eorum ope diu invicta steterat, & floruerat, quamque ipsi porrò à Barbarorum insultibus texissent, nisi à Christianis ibi degentibus offensi, eidem sese subduxissent. Vide illius operis lib. I. c. III. in quo eos redarguit, qui

à victis Trojæ Penatibus Urbem defensum iri, semperque victricem fore, stultâ persuasione credebant.

Accedat Rabbi Maimonides, ut à Dionysio Vossio redditur p. VIII. *Congregati*, nimirum Idololatræ, *adorabant ea*, Idola, *Universis indicantes, ab his simulachris bona, & mala omnia provenire: & proinde summo jure coli, ac metui.*

Denique Athenagoras Legatione pro Christianis p. XXV. tradit Idololatras asseruisse multa miracula ab Idolis fieri consuevisse: quos confutat, docendo nihil aut boni, aut mali fieri ob Idolis, quæ verò illis tribuuntur, ab Assistente spiritu malo fieri. Quorsum ista, si Pagani non illum errorem errarunt, quem illis adscribimus, nempe Idola ipsa, bonorum malorumque causas esse?

Ex iis, quæ hactenus dicta sunt, constat, Paganos Idolis suis adscripsisse quidquid vel boni recipiebant, vel mali patiebantur. Eos illa invocasse: adeoque credidisse veros Deos esse, vera numina. Hæc illis exprobrant Patres, hæc Ethnici ipsi agnoscunt; hæc denique de illis tradunt ipsæ Divinæ Scripturæ. Quæ fusiùs à me pertractata sunt, variisque auctoritatibus cum sacris, tum Prophanis confirmata, quòd tam insulsus sit error, quem errarunt, ut fidem vix essem inventurus, nisi tam evidentes tamque solidas rationes adferrem ad id probandum, quàm evidenter patet cum sano sensu, & nativo rationis lumine (quod in illis summum fuisse ultrò fatemur) pugnare dictum errorem. Tanta quippe erat ex unâ parte superstitionis insulsitas, ut nullus mentis compos eam amplecti posse videatur. Tanta vero ex aliâ parte in plerisque Ethnicis, Philosophis potissimùm, ingenii subtilitas, tanta judicii soliditas, ut à quovis errore saltem Crassiori tuti videri possent. Hinc ex quo ad Controversiam istam explicandam animum applicui, suspectæ mihi sæpe fuerunt ratiocinationes meæ, & dubitare subinde coactus fui, ne fortè minus eorum mentem essem assecutus, aut nimis abjectè de illis sentirem: nec plenum illis rationibus meis, assensum antea præstiti, quàm quæ hinc inde dicta fuissent expendissem: quid scilicet Ethnicis Patres exprobrassent; quid verò his respondissent illi: & potissimùm quid de his in sacrâ

Scrip-

Scripturâ Divinus Spiritus revelasset. Cumque tandem vidissem à Patribus unâ voce firmiter, & asseveranter Idolorum, & Hominum mortuorum, dæmonumque cultum supremum, quem *Latriam* appellamus, Ethnicis objici; neutrum verò ab istis rotundo ore, simpliciter, & absolutè negari; sed aut agnosci planè, aut recurrendo ad Allegorias excusari, atque veluti incrustari, tum enim verò omnis dubitatio evanuit, maximè cum viderem quidquid à Patribus dictum fuisset, ex Divinis litteris confirmari. Superest, tam fædi, tam pudendi erroris fontem investigemus.

SECTIO XXIX.

Causæ tam probrosi Erroris ex Apostolo.

DE hoc agit Apostolus cum Rom. 1. à Versu 18. tum Ephes. IV. 17. In priori loco hæc habet: *Revelatur Ira Dei de cælo, super omnem impietatem, & injustitiam hominum illorum, qui veritatem Dei in injustitiâ detinent: quia quod notum est Dei, manifestum est illis, Deus enim illis manifestavit. Invisibilia enim ipsius, à creaturâ mundi, per ea, quæ facta sunt, intellecta conspiciuntur, sempiterna quoque ejus Virtus, & Divinitas: ita ut sint inexcusabiles, quia cum cognovissent Deum, non sicut Deum glorificaverunt, aut* GRATIAS EGERUNT; *sed evanuerunt in cogitationibus suis, &* OBSCURATUM EST INSIPIENS COR *eorum. Dicentes enim se esse sapientes,* STULTI FACTI *sunt: & mutaverunt Gloriam incorruptibilis Dei in similitudinem Imaginis corruptibilis hominis, & volucrum, & quadrupedum, & serpentium.* Hæc Apostolus ibi. In posteriori verò loco. Gentilibus exprobrat similem in mente cæcitatem: *Dico, & testificor in Domino,* inquit, *ut jam non ambuletis, sicut & Gentes ambulant, in vanitate sensus sui, tenebris obscuratum habentes intellectum, alienati à vitâ Dei, per ignorantiam, quæ & in illis, propter cæcitatem cordis ipsorum,* &c. In utroque loco Gentilium *Stultitiam, Insipientiam, Ignorantiam, cordis cæcitatem.* exponit. In priori verò illarum causas breviter complexus est. Quarum

Prima

Prima est, Justum Dei judicium, eos homines, qui ejus veritati resistebant, mentis Insipientiâ, cordisque cæcitate punientis. Eo nimirum modo, quo Pharaonem induraſſe dicitur, talem illi non dando Gratiam, quâ emolliretur; non verò quod nullam prorsus illi dederit, multò minus, quod eum positivè, inspiratâ mali voluntate induruerit. De quo alii. *Revelatur*, inquit, *Ira Dei de cælo, super impietatem eorum hominum, qui veritatem Dei in Injustitiâ detinent.* Id est, ejus (veritatis) *progressum*, hominumque ad eam conversionem, injustè impediunt.

Secunda causa est Ingrati animi vitium. *Non sicut Deum glorificaverunt, aut Gratias egerunt.* Ingratitudo porrò est velut *ventus urens, exsiccans fontem Misericordiæ, & fluenta Gratiæ*, ait S. Bernardus.

Tertia est ipsorum superbia, nimiùm de suorum Ingeniorum Præstantiâ præsumentium: *Evanuerunt in cogitationibus suis*, inquit, *Dicentes se esse sapientes, stulti facti sunt:*

Audiamus Origenem hæc eadem paraphrasticōs enarrantem: l. VI. contra Celsum pag. CCLXXVII. *Absolutis Disputationibus egregiis*, inquit, *De Animâ, ejusque post exactam rectè vitam fœlicitate, missa faciunt* Philosophi *illa præclara, quæ Deus illis aperuit, humilia parvaque sapiunt, Gallum vovent Æsculapio* (Socratem sugillat) *& invisibilia Dei, atque Ideas contemplati, ex creatione hujus mundi, rebusque sensibilibus, à quibus ascendentes ad intelligibiles, æternam ejus potentiam, & Divinitatem non obscurè viderunt, nihilominus stulti facti sunt in suis ratiocinationibus, & cor eorum, quasi nihil intelligeret, volutatur in tenebris, atque ignorantiâ veræ Religionis. Licetque videre valde sibi placentes, Sapientia atque adeo Theologia nomine, adorare simulachrum hominis corruptibilis, velleque videri id facere in honorem Numinis. Quin & ad Ægyptiorum superstitionem se dejicere, & ad cultum volucrum, quadrupedum, atque Reptilium.* Hæc Origenes: ubi supra.

SE-

SECTIO XXX.

Ejusdem Criminis aliæ causæ ex Libro Sapientiæ.

HAbentur istæ Sap. XIV. à v. 15. *Acerbo luctu dolens Pater, citò sibi rapti filii fecit imaginem, & illum, qui tunc quasi homo mortuus fuerat, nunc tamquam Deum colere cæpit, & constituit inter Servos suos sacra & sacrificia. Deinde interveniente tempore convalescente iniquâ consuetudine, hic error tanquam lex custoditus est, & Tyrannorum imperio, colebantur figmenta. Et hos, quos in palam honorare non poterant, propter hoc quod longè essent, è longinquo figura eorum allata, evidentem imaginem Regis, quem honorare volebant, fecerunt: ut illum, qui aberat, tanquam præsentem colerent, suâ solicitudine, Provexit autem ad horum culturam, & hos, qui ignorabant, Artificis eximia diligentia. Ille enim volens placere, illi, qui se assumpserat, elaboravit arte suâ, ut similitudinem in melius figuraret. Multitudo autem hominum abducta per speciem operis, eum, qui ante tempus tanquam homo honoratus fuerat, nunc Deum æstimaverunt. Et hæc fuit vitæ humanæ deceptio: quoniam aut Affectui, aut Regibus servientes homines, incommunicabile nomen lapidibus, & lignis imposuerunt.* Hæc ibi. Quæ causas varias continent ab iis quas præcedenti Sectione retulimus planè diversas.

Prima est affectus in consanguineos. *Acerbo luctu dolens Pater, citò sibi rapti filii fecit imaginem, eumque tanquam Deum colere cæpit, & constituit inter Servos suos sacra, & sacrificia.* De quo Minutius: *Sit sacra facta sunt, quæ fuerant inventa solatia.* Ex Saliano observavi supra, non solos Patres filiis suis; sed etiam filios Patribus statuas constituisse, eorumque cultum sacrum propagasse tametsi solùm Patrum hic fiat mentio, ob rationem alibi datam.

Similis affectus causa fuit, quod Antinous puer Bithinicus ob singularem formæ elegantiam Adriano Cæsari gratissimus, ab ipso, templo Mantinææ constructo cultus fuerit, & cælo, syderibusque insertus. Hunc ultimum fuisse ferunt, quem Bithinici tali modo consecrarunt.

runt. Galilæus equidem Jovis satellites, stellas Medicæas vocavit; & Recentiores Astrologi clarorum virorum nomina Lunæ disco inscripserunt. Nemo tamen ita desipiet, ut credat aut hos, aut illum quidquam cum Paganâ superstitione, aut Hominum inter eos Apotheosi commune habere.

Huic affinis est alter affectus Gratitudinis in benè de se, devè humano genere meritos, ob inventam artem aliquam hominibus utilem aut aliquod insigne beneficium. Hinc Minerva ob repertum Lanificium, Ceres ob panis, Dionysus, sive Bacchus, ob vini usum, Vulcanus ob fabrilem artem: Romulus, quod æternam Urbem condidisset: Flora, quod eandem suis opibus ditasset, Larentia, quod Romulum, & Remum expositos nutrisset, Stercutius, sive Sterquilinus, quod agros stercorare docuisset, mutinus item sive Matunus, aliam ob causam (vide Tertul. Apolog. c.xxiv.) Alii ob alias Artes, sive Beneficia, Dii facti sunt.

Regali imperio non modò Regni pomeria prolata; sed & Religiosum alicujus Numinis cultum propagatum, dubitari non potest. Ex Danielis c. iii. liquet injunctam statuæ à Nabuchodonosore erectæ venerationem, propositâ non adoranti acerbissimæ mortis pœnâ. Alter Nabuchodonosor Holoferni militiæ suæ Principi *præcepit, ut omnes Deos terræ exterminaret, ut ipse solus haberetur Deus ab in Nationibus, quas sibi subjugaret.* Judith iii. 13. Unde duplici jugo civili, & Religioso Victorum colla premi volebat.

Solitum Romanum Senatum Cæsares deificare, notius est, quàm ut à me referri oporteat. Initium à Cajo Julio Cesarum primo factum; qui mos ad Constantini Magni tempora duravit. Quibus id fieret ceremoniis, dicunt passim alii. In Jure Civili Justinianeo Imperatores defuncti *Diverum* titulo insigniuntur, sive id factum ex more à Paganis ad Christianos transmisso, sive (quod magis arridet) ex privato Triboniani Pagani studio, cujus operâ præcipuè Justinianus in eo Jure concinnando usus esse dicitur.

Hæc quidem omnia concurrisse nullus dubito. Certum non minus est statuarum speciem, homini similem, haud parum ad fascinandos

dos homines, & ad colenda figmenta illa traducendos plurimum attulisse momenti: Dicitur enim loco supra laudato, *Provexit ad horum culturam Artificis eximia diligentia. Ille enim volens placere illi, qui se assumpsit, elaboravit arte suâ ut similitudinem in melius figuraret; multitudo autem hominum abducta perspetiem operis, eum, qui ante tempus tanquam homo honoratus fuerat, nunc Deum æstimaverunt.*

Audiamus Minutium Felicem: *Quis dubitat*, inquit, *horum imagines consecratas vulgus orare, & publicè colere, dum Opinio, & Metus Imperitorum Artis concinnitate decipitur.*

Augustinus idem confirmat in Psal. CXIII. Conc. II. *Homines talibus superstitionibus obligati*, inquit, *plerumque ad ipsum solem dorsum ponentes, preces fundunt statuæ, quam Solem vocant: & cum sonitu maris à tergo feriantur, Neptuni statuam, quam pro ipso mari colunt, quasi sentientem gemitibus feriunt. Hoc enim facit, & quodammodo extorquet illa figura membrorum, ut animus vivens in sensibus corporis, magis arbitretur sentire corpus, quod suo simillimum videt, quam rotundum solem, undasque diffusas, & quidquid non iisdem lineamentis formatum conspicit, quibus illa formata sunt, quæ viventia videre consuevit.* Et cum dixisset, apud nos, Christianos, in honore esse vasa Sacra, per quæ Deo supplicamus, non tamen à nobis adorari, addit: *Illa causa est maxima* IMPIETATIS INSANÆ, *quod plus valet in affectibus miserorum similis viventi forma, quæ sibi efficit supplicari, quam quod eam manifestum est non esse viventem, ut debeat à vivente contemni. Plus enim valent simulachra ad curvandam infælicem animam, quod os habent, oculos habent, aures habent, nares habent, manus habent, pedes habent, quam ad corrigendam, quod non loquentur, non videbunt, non audient, non odorabunt, non contrectabunt, non ambulabunt.* Hæc Augustinus.

Hinc factum arbitror, ut tametsi in Mosaici Tabernaculi, & Templi Hierosolymitani Sacris statuæ Seraphinorum, & aliorum etiam animalium similitudines sculptæ collocatæ fuerint, extra tamen ejusmodi septa Sacra aliquid ejusmodi nusquam extiterit, imò severissimè prohibitum fuerit aliquid illiusmodi fieri. Sacerdotibus enim solis, atque Levitis patebat illa Templi pars, in quâ statuæ, ornatus causâ, collocatæ erant: quibus, nempe Levitis, non magnum erat ab Idolo-

latriâ periculum. In atriis verò cum Judæorum, tum Gentium nihil ejusmodi occurrebat, ne esset imperitis Judæis ad Idololatriam propensis *lapis offensionis, & petra scandali.*

Malè tamen hinc inferes, etiamnum in Ecclesiâ permitti non debere ejusmodi statuas eandem ob causam, periculum scilicet Idololatriæ. Non enim eadem est ratio; tum quia plebs non adeo jam propendet in fædam illam superstitionem; ad Irreligionem, & Atheismum magis inclinatur: tum quia diligentia, quam ex Tridentini Concilii præscripto adhibent Concionatores, & Parochi ad explicandum verum statuarum usum, tutas ab eo periculo præstat eorum oves.

SECTIO XXXI.

Vltima nefandi criminis causa, diaboli Præsentia in Idolis.

ubi

De statuarum Consecrationem & Oraculis.

NUlla quantum memini in sacris Litteris occurrit mentio diaboli sese intra statuas insinuantis, indeque præstigias suas explicantis, quibus homines Deo ingrati, externâ artis specie capti, vel amore vel metu commoti, planè corrumperentur, & à sanâ mente alienarentur; non dubium tamen mihi est ita evenisse: & dæmonem *statuæ Consecratione* ad eandem alligari. Lucianus Presbyter apud Eusebium l. IX. hist. c. VI. ad Consecrationem revocat Deificationem statuæ. Tertull. Apolog. c. XII. ait: *Statuas Sorores esse vasculorum communium, aut ex ipsis vasculis; quasi fatum consecratione mutassent.* Et l. de spectaculis c. X. *In mortuorum Idolis dæmonia delitescunt.* Et l. de coronâ militis: *Ipsum opus* (statua) *mortuum quantum in Idolis; vivum planè quantum in dæmoniis, ad quæ pertinet superstitio.* Et Minutius Felix: *Isti impuri spiritus sub statuis, & Imaginibus delitescunt.* Idem habet Cyprianus lib. Ad Demetrianum.

Ar-

Arnobius lib. VII. adversus Gentes: *Isti impuri spiritus*, inquit, *ut ostensum est à Magis, à Philosophis, & à Platone, sub statuis, & Imaginibus consecratis delitescunt, & afflatu suo auctoritatem quasi præsentis numinis consequuntur: dum inspirantur interim vatibus, dum sacris immorantur, dum nonnunquam extorum fibras animant, avium volatus gubernant, sortes regunt, oracula efficiunt, falsis pluribus involuta: nam & falluntur, & fallunt, ut & nescientes sinceram veritatem, & quam sciunt, in perditionem sui non confitentes.* Hęc Arnobius.

Et Augustinus l. VIII. de Civ. Dei cap. XXIII. Hæc ex Hermete Trismegisto refert. *Ille alios Deos dicit à summo Deo factos, alios ab hominibus: hoc qui audit, sicut à me positum est, putat dici de simulachris quæ opera sunt manuum hominum. At ille visibilia simulachra Deorum esse asserit. Inesse autem his quosdam spiritus invitatos, qui valeant aliquid sive ad nocendum, sive ad desideria eorum nonnulla complenda, à quibus iis divini honores, & cultûs obsequia deferuntur. Hos ergo spiritus invisibiles per artem quandam visibilibus rebus corporalis materiæ copulare, ut sint quasi animata corpora illis spiritibus dicata, & subdita simulachra: hoc esse dicit Deos facere: eamque magnam & mirabilem Deos faciendi accepisse homines potestatem.* Et subinde refert illius Ægyptii verba Latio donata.

Ceremoniis aliquibus, solemnibusque ritibus fieri consuevisse dictam Idoli consecrationem, mihi indubitatum est, præscribentibus eas dæmonibus, quo potentiùs infatuarent homines. Potentes eas fuisse, & ut plurimùm sortitas effectum, æquè certum videtur. Tertullianus l. de Idololatriâ: *Vtique scimus*, inquit, *licet nomina inania, atque conficta sint, cum tamen in superstitionem deducuntur, rapere ad se dæmonia, & omnem spiritum immundum, per consecrationis obligamentum.* Unde sequi videtur, ex Peregrinis, Barbaris, nihilque significantibus vocibus consecrationis Idoli formam, fas sit ita loqui, compositam fuisse. Quod in Magicis ut plurimum usu venit.

Quod ad materiam hujus consecrationis spectat, videtur oleum adhibitum, & fortè corōnas, sive serta, insuper addita. Id colligo ex Luciano in dialogo, cui titulus: *Deorum concilium. Lapis omnis*, inquit, *omnisque ara vaticinatur, quæ sit oleo perfusa, & coronas habeat, cuique vir*

prastigiator suppetat, quales multi sunt. Et eo facilius sentio oleum à dæmone (qui Dei Simia est) requisitum fuisse, quòd Jacob simili modo lapidem oleo delibutum, *in titulum erexisse* dicitur, Gen. XXVIII. 18. Et altaria holocausti, thymiamatis, & totam Tabernaculi Mosaici sacram supellectilem olei (licet non simplicis; sed variis aromatibus mixti) unctione consecrata fuisse, habetur Exod. XXX. 26. & 27.

Licet verò credam adhibitam sæpe fuisse solemnem ejusmodi consecrationem, non tamen semper. Nihil quippe opus magno ceremoniarum apparatu, ad accersendos dæmones, quò suâ sponte properabant ad dementandos homines miseros. Martialis alicubi dicitur insinuare, Deûm invocatione exercitè consecrari statuam. *Sed firmiorem habemus Propheticum sermonem cui attendimus*, apud Isaiam c. XLIV. à versu 14. ubi Ligni progressum describit à primâ ejus in saltu plantatione, donec in Deum mirabili metamorphosi transeat, & adoretur, & nullam de ejus consecratione facit mentionem: eam non omissurus utique, si semper adhibita fuisset, cum longè minutiora recenseat. *Reliquum ejus* Ligni, inquit, *Deum fecit, & sculptile sibi, curvatur ante illud, & adorat illud, & obsecrat, dicens: Libera me, quia Deus meus es tu.* Solâ proinde veneratione statua initiabatur; quia ea dæmonem illum, qui nomen Viri per statuam illam repræsentati assumebat, invitabat ad testandum sibi grata fore obsequia illa, preces exauditas esse, & se in posterum propitium fore, statuam illam, seu Idolum, quod Deus exinde credebatur, adorantibus, & invocantibus.

Aliquando clarâ, & cunctis intelligibili voce loquebatur Idoli incola, dæmon, ut cum militi statuam Junonis jocose interroganti, an Romam ire vellet? Respondit: *Volo.* Plerumque tamen per alios responsa reddebant. Apollo nimirùm per Pythiam, alibi per columbas Dodonides, de quibus supra obiter, sed communissimè apud Romanos per Avium volatum, pullorum cibatum, communissimè per extorum formam in Sacrificiis.

Quod ad res ipsas, quas nunciabant, attinet: eæ vel actu existebant, licet in locis dissitis, vel erant futuræ. De Prioribus certam poterant habere notitiam, easque verè nuntiare, vel ob intellectus sui

præ-

præstantiam, ad loca remotissima pertingentis: vel ob summam Agilitatem, illuc transire poterant, ubi & res quæque gerebatur, & inde veluti momento redire, vel denique per spiritus sibi similes illinc advenientes. Unde fieri poterat, ut in iis enunciandis nec fallerentur ipsi, nec alios fallerent. Aliquando tamen etiam in his falsa nunciabant, ut habetur in Actis B. Bartholomæi, quando dixerunt bellum imminens fore anceps, & valde cruentum: cum tamen tantum non præ foribus Regiæ adessent Legati ab æmulo Rege missi, Pacem quibuscumque conditionibus petentes.

De futuris rebus cum solùm conjecturalem earum cognitionem haberent, qualem habent sæpenumero Viri Prudentes, in iis enunciandis, frequenter aberrabant à vero: ne tamen error facilè deprehenderetur, oracula iis verbis concipiebant, quæ in alterutram partem accipi possent (quod faciunt etiamnum nostri Astrologi) unde quidquid contingebat, sua apud stupidos & superstitione dementatos homines Oraculo constabat auctoritas. Quod observat Cicero l. altero de Divinatione, & B. Hieronymus. Tale fuit Oraculum à Pythiâ Cræso redditum, *si fluvium Halim transiret, eum maxima regna perditurum.* Quod tum de suo, tum de Cyri Imperio intelligi poterat. Item aliud Pyrrho datum, cum Romanis bellum inferre vellet: *Dico te, Æacida Romanos vincere posse.* Hinc Prudentiores quique Pagani Oraculorum fraudes subodorati illa susque deque tandem habuêre. Lucianus in dial. Jupiter Tragædus, cum Apollo vaticinatus esset, subdit tamquam à Momo dictum: *Perspicuè dicit Oraculum, Apollinem esse præstigiatorem: nos verò clitellarios Asinos, & Mulos, qui credimus ipsi non tantum habentes Prudentiæ, quantum locustæ.* Solius quippe Dei est futura certò cognoscere, *qui vocat ea, quæ non sunt, tanquam ea, quæ sunt* Unde Isaias c. XLI. 23. *Annuntiate, quæ ventura sunt in futurum, & sciemus, quia Dii estis vos.* Hinc Tertullianus Apologetici c. XX. *Testimonium Divinitatis est veritas Divinationis.*

SE-

SECTIO XXXII.

Vsus Imaginum & statuarum licitus est in Ecclesiâ Catholicâ.

DE statuis & Imaginibus quia eadem est ratio, de utrisque indiscriminatim agemus: & quæ de alterutris dicentur; de aliis intelligenda sunt.

Primus usus, sive prima utilitas sacrarum Imaginum, est, ut Idiotas, & rusticos, qui legere non possunt, instruant. Gregorius M. lib. IX. Reg. Epist. IX. *Quod legentibus Scriptura*, inquit, *hoc Idiotis præstat Pictura: quia in ipsâ vident, quid sequi debeant, in ipsâ legunt, qui litteras nesciunt*, sic qui vident Christi infantis in præsepio jacentis imaginem, filium Dei carnem factum, nobis in vili tugurio natum discunt. Qui eundem intuetur, Cruci affixum, discit quanta pro nobis passus sit. Qui Stephanum in medio lapidum imbre, Laurentium in craticulâ, Petrum in Cruce, Paulum Gladio cervices porrigentem intuetur novit, quanta Sancti passi sint tormenta, ut ad Martyrii palmam pervenirent.

Secunda utilitas est, ut iis, quorum sunt Repræsentationes, debitus honor deferatur. Viris Illustribus, de Patriâ, de clientibus de consanguineis bene meritis erectas olim statuas fuisse, adeo notum est, ut, id probare velle, esset & meo labore, & Lectoris ocio vehementer abuti; maximè cum aliquid eâ de re jam dixerim. Constat de statuâ à muliere Christi D. virtute à sanguinis profluvio sanatâ, quam Julianus cognomento Apostata amoveri jussit, & suam eidem basi imponi, ut alibi diximus.

Tertia; magna sunt Ecclesiarum ornamenta, quæ tantum inde splendorem accipiunt, ut cælestis Hierusalem speciem quandam exhibere videantur.

Quarta: mentem intuentium fugacem & versabilem, detinent ab evagationibus distractionibusque, & ad objectum aliquod bonum alligant. Etenim:

Segnius

Segnius irritant animos dimissa per aurem,
Quàm quæ sunt oculis subjecta fidelibus ——

ait Poëta Lyricus. Si Christum in Cruce pependisse audiam, id longè minus diu afficit, quàm si ejus effigiem affabrè factam conspiciam. Eam ob causam præceptum credo in veteri Lege Phylacteria extimis vestibus assui, quorum conspectu de mandatorum observatione identidem admonerentur Israëlitæ. Huic affinis est

Quinta: potentissimè ad Christi Sanctorumque imitationem excitant conspectæ eorum imagines. B. Chrysostomus præ oculis habere solebat S. Pauli effigiem, quâ conspectâ ad ejus imitationem exardescebat. B. Teresia secum circumferre solebat imaginem Samaritanæ, cujus verba identidem repetebat: *Domine, da mihi hanc aquam, ut non sitiam in æternum.* Ipsa alibi describit, quam commota ad Dei super omnia amorem, peccatique detestationem fuerit, ubi inexpectatò in Christi columnæ alligati, flagellisq; crudelissimè cæsi oculos conjecit.

Quæ omnia paucis complexa est Sacro-sancta Tridentina Synodus, Sess. xxv. *Illud verò diligenter doceant Episcopi, per historias mysteriorum nostræ Redemptionis, picturis, vel aliis similitudinibus expressas, erudiri, & confirmari populum in articulis fidei commemorandis, & assiduè recolendis: tum verò ex omnibus sacris Imaginibus, magnum fructum percipi; non solùm quia admonetur populus beneficiorum, & munerum, quæ à Christo sibi collata sunt; sed etiam quia Dei per Sanctos miracula, & salutaria exempla oculis fidelium subjiciuntur, ut pro iis Deo gratias agant, ad Sanctorumque imitationem vitam, moresque suos componant; excitentur ad adorandum, & diligendum Deum, & ad pietatem colendam.* Hæc sacra Tridentina Synodus.

Objiciunt Hæretici: prohibitas cujuscumque creaturæ similitudines lege Naturæ, si quidem Exo. xx. 4. Dicitur: *Non facias tibi sculptile, neque omnem similitudinem, quæ est in cælo desuper, & quæ in terrâ deorsum, nec eorum quæ sunt in aquis sub terrâ. Non adorabis ea, neque coles.* Ubi duo prohibentur: primum, facere sculptile, sive quamcunque similitudinem, stellarum, animalium, plantarumve, atque piscium: Alterum, ejusmodi similitudinem sive apud eam Deum adorare, sive colere. Ergo quantæcunque sint Imaginum, statuarumque utilitates, illicitæ tamen sunt.

Respondeo 1. non toti generi humano data omnia illa præcepta, quæ ad versum usque 17. illius Capitis inclusivè continentur. Hoc constat 1. ex præfatione iis præfixâ. *Ego Dominus Deus tuus, qui eduxi te de terrâ Ægypti, de domo servitutis.* Quod solis Israëlitis dici potuit. Constat 2. ex versu 8. *Memento, ut diem Sabbati sanctifices.* Illius enim diei observationem non omnes homines obligare, etiam post Christi Dom. adventum, liquet, quia a Christianis nunquam fuit observata, nisi ad tempus, ut *Synagoga honorificè deduceretur ad sepulchrum*, ut ait in simili Hieronymus. Fuerunt itaque præcepta illa directè solis Israëlitis imposita, licet aliqua ad cunctos se extenderint homines, quia aliàs data fuerant Adamo, atque Noë, & exinde eorum posteros obligârint.

Resp. 2. hoc speciatim præceptum de non faciendis rerum creatarum similitudinibus, non fuit de Lege naturæ. Probatur: nam dubitant Theologi, an in eâ lege à Deo dispensari possit, & plerique censent non posse, saltem in præceptis primæ tabulæ, quale est hoc, quo de agimus. Magis adhuc concordes sunt in negando Deum de facto dispensasse, aut aliquid unquam imperasse contra præcepta Legis naturæ. At imperavit aliquid contra hoc præceptum, si ita intelligatur, ut volunt hæretici: quia jussit fieri Seraphim, serpentem æneum &c. Et scientiâ infusâ instruxit Ooliab, & Beseleel, Exod. xxxi. ad ea formanda. Non ergo est de Lege naturæ istud Præceptum.

Verus itaque dicti præcepti sensus est, non licuisse Israëliticæ Plebi facere rerum quarumcumque similitudines. Idque primò propter periculum Idololatriæ. Secundò, quò magis ab aliarum gentium more secederent. Constat enim varia Israëlitis injuncta fuisse, ut quàm longissimè ab aliarum Gentium moribus separarentur. Quod non solus Maimonides; sed etiam Epistola, quæ Eleazaro adscribitur, & citatur ab Eusebio in Præpar. Euang. testantur.

Unde constat non obstante illo præcepto licuisse Christianis, & etiamnum licere facere similitudines illiusmodi: Saltem ex illo præcepto non sufficienter evincitur illud esse, prohibitum. Quod confirmat antiqua Ecclesiæ Praxis. Tert. l. de Pudic. c. VII, & X. testatur ipsius

ipsius tempore in ipsis sacris calicibus descriptam fuisse Christi ovem humeris suis gestantis imaginem. Aug. l. 1. de cons. Euang. cap. x. testatur eundem Christum Dom. in Templi Parietibus depingi consuevisse cum BB. Apostolis hinc inde ab utroq; latere pendentibus. B. Gregorius Nazianzenus oratione in Laudem Defuncti Patris, refert Templum ab ipso constructum variis picturis sacris exornatum. Denique B. Paulinus Epist. XII. loquitur de Imaginibus SS. Trinitatis, & mysteriorum vitæ Christi, in Ecclesiæ apside pingi solitis: cujus consuetudinis vestigia etiamnum Romæ cernere est, in antiquioribus Basilicis.

SECTIO XXXIII.

Sacrarum Imaginum, & statuarum Adoratio, sive cultus.

SUppono 1. Honorem, Adorationem, Cultum diversas esse voces, quæ tamen eandem propemodum rem important, demissionem nimirum Animæ coram alio ob Perfectionem aliquam in excellenti gradu, sive nostrâ majorem, vel reipsâ, vel in hominum existimatione, eorum saltem, qui illam venerantur, & adorant, in altero repertam.

Suppono 2. duo in quâque statuâ, vel imagine considerari posse; rem absolutam, lignum, nimirum, lapidem ex quo conflatur (idem est, proportione servatâ de Imagine) & relativam, ipsam formam, humanam verbi causâ, sive speciem secundum quam similis est objecto, quod repræsentat. Ex quibus patet hujus Difficultatis explicatio. Quia

Si statua consideretur, ut est res quædam absoluta, & talis materia, ebur scilicet, æs, lignum, aut aliquid ejusmodi, nullus honor illi debetur; quia sic sumpta nullam habet excellentiam honore dignam. Imò homo quilibet eâ sic spectatâ melior, & honore dignior est.

Si verò sumatur, ut res relativa, alteri rei honore dignæ similis,

similis, illam repræsentans, illi cultus, honor, adoratio debetur, quemadmodum & prototypo: cum istâ tamen differentiâ, quod Prototypo debeatur ille cultus propter se, & excellentiam illi intrinsecam: statuas verò tantum propter connexionem, & velut unitatem, ne dicam identitatem moralem cum illo, cui proinde excellentia extrinseca est. Unde objectum colitur primariè, per se, & propter se; statua verò secundariò, propter aliud, & per accidens.

Hoc didici ex Concilio VII. Act. III. In quâ lectæ fuerunt, & approbatæ Orientalium Episcoporum litteræ, hæc verba continentes: *Sanctas Imagines reveremur*, &c. *non in materiâ, aut in coloribus honorem constituentes; sed per hoc officium nostrum, quod ipsis debemus, quorum typum Imagines gestant, impertientes.* Et Concilium Tridentinum Sess. XXV. in Decreto de Vener. Imag. *Imaginibus venerationem debitam impertiendam esse*, &c. *quoniam honos, qui eis exhibetur, refertur ad Prototypa, quæ illæ repræsentant: ita ut per Imagines, quas osculamur, & coram quibus caput aperimus, & procumbimus, Christum adoremus, & Sanctos veneremur, quorum illæ similitudinem gerunt.*

Sancti Patres Imaginum cultum & venerationem laudibus prosecuti sunt. B. Athanasius in quæst. ad Antioch. q. XXXIX. eos ait esse dementes, & fastu quodam arreptitio, quia crucem, effigiesque Sanctorum adorare recusant. B. Basilius Epist. ad Julianum Apostatam, postquam de cultu Christo Domino, Deiparæ Virgini, aliisque Sanctis debito, & à se exhibito locutus est, subjungit: *Unde & Characteres Imaginum ipsorum honoro, & adoro: præcipuè cum hoc à* SANCTIS APOSTOLIS TRADITUM SIT. B. Hieronymus in Epitaphio S. Paulæ c. III. dicit, illam prostratam ante crucem, quasi pendentem in eâ Dominum cerneret, adorasse. Plures alii Patres in hujus veritatis confirmationem citantur in Synodo VII. generali, Act. IV. Ubi videri possunt etiam varia miracula à Deo per intercessionem Sanctorum facta. Unde hujus veritatis confirmationem certissimam colligo: nec enim Deus superstitiosum, illicitumve cultum, multò minus Idololatricum, unquam confirmavit, ne tanti Peccati Auctor censeretur.

SE-

SECTIO XXXIV.

Cultus Imaginum, & Statuarum sacrarum non est Idololatria.

QUidquid Ecclesia à nobis exigit, quidquid Concilium Tridentinum definivit, quidquid Concionatores Ecclesiâ approbante docent, his paucis verbis Professionis Fidei, Pii PP. IV. jussu editæ continetur: *Firmissimè assero, Imagines Christi, ac Deiparæ semper Virginis, nec non aliorum Sanctorum habendas ac retinendas esse: atque eis debitum honorem ac venerationem impertiendam.* Hæc ibi. Illis porrò *debitus honor* est *relativus*; non *absolutus*: non sistit in Imagine; sed transit ad Prototypon: nec enim Imago quidquam habet laude, honore, æstimatione dignum, ut jam diximus.

Hæc cum ita sint non mirari non possumus, quâ fiduciâ, quâ fronte cultus iste dicatur cum Paganorum Idololatriâ convenire: inter quæ tantum Chaos firmatum est, ut æquè facilè duos cæli polos conjungere possimus, ac duplicem illum cultum, in unum conflare. Ad quod demonstrandum abundè sufficiunt, quæ diximus: adeo ut nihil jam agendum supersit, quàm ea ad præsentem materiam applicare; unde clarissima discrimina ultrò sese offerunt. Nam

1. Pagani crediderunt Idola sua veros esse Deos, vera numina; Veramque virtutem Divinam in iis residere, nos nec Imagines, statuasve Christi Domini Christum esse dicimus, neque Sanctorum repræsentationes Sanctos ipsos appellamus, nisi καταχρηστικῶς, vel expressè addito, vel tacitè subintellecto, Syncategoremate diminuente, aut alienante, quo modo Imago equi dicitur *Equus pictus*, & hominis Imago, *homo pictus*: quod nihil aliud significat, quam *Pictura hominis*, aut *equi*: nec ullam virtutem supernaturalem, multò minùs divinam his inhærere sentimus. Hinc Synodus Tridentina Sess. xxv. sæpe laudatâ, cum sacras Imagines colendas esse decrevisset

visset, subdit, id non fieri, *quod credatur inesse aliqua in eis Divinitas, vel virtus, propter quam sint colendæ, veluti olim fiebat à Gentibus.*

2. Pagani sua colebant Idola, ut veros Deos, Sacrificiis, libaminibus, suffitibus, qui actus ex communi Gentium consensu & usu temporum illorum, in honore divino usurpabantur; Ecclesia nec Sanctorum Imaginibus, nec ipsis Sanctis, Sacrificium unquam obtulit (imò iis sacrificantes anathemate percutit) nec ullum sacris Imaginibus cultum supremum, sive Latriæ, exhibuit.

3. Spem illi fiduciamque in suis Idolis collocabant, ab his fatum urbium, Monarchiarum incolumitatem, Gentium fælicitatem pendere credebant. Sic Trojam capi non posse, nisi ablato inde Palladio stulto errore sibi persuaserant & Græci, & Trojani: parem in victis Trojæ Penatibus, suisque Anciliis fiduciam habuêre Romani; in Herculis statuâ Tyrii, in aliis alii. Nos in nostris statuis, Imaginibusve, nullam fiduciam reponimus. Hoc etiam discrimen ex Tridentino desumitur: *Non quod fiducia in Imaginibus sit figenda*, inquit, *quod fiebat olim à Gentibus.* Ex hoc discrimine sequitur

4. Suis Idolis illi supplicabant, ab iis petebant, quæ illis usui essent; nos nostras Imagines nunquam invocamus. Scimus nos ab iis non audiri, multò minus exaudiri. Has oculos habere agnoscimus, & nihil videre; aures, nec quidquam audire; os, non tamen loqui; pedes, nec eos movere posse. Denique veros truncos esse, veros stipites, quovis homine, Bruto, plantâ, si naturam spectemus, deteriores, & inutiliores, sensu, motuque privatos. Vnde non solum frustra, sed etiam stolidè invocarentur. Hinc sequitur discrimen.

5. Nos ex iis, quæ vel boni nanciscimur, vel mali toleramus, nihil ab Imaginibus nostris proficisci putamus: his nec habemus, nec agimus Gratias, pro beneficiis: è contra suis Ethnici Idolis cuncta accepta ferebant: si quid mali patiebantur, Idola sua placabant; si quid boni obtinebant, Idolis habebant Gratias, & *Laudabant Deos suos aureos, & argenteos*, &c. Dan. v. 4. pro Victoriis de aliis Gentibus reportatis.

Super-

Superest sextum, & ultimum discrimen: Imago est Rei veræ repræsentatio; Idolum verò rei falsæ. De quo videantur Bellarminus, qui id ex sacris Litteris nervosè probat, aliique Theologi, & Controvertistæ qui pedibus in ejus sententiam ierunt. Nobis satis esse videntur alia discrimina ad id, quod totâ istâ Appendice probare conati sumus, nimirum Imaginum cultum cum Idolorum Adoratione nihil habere commune: Ecclesiam à fædo, detestandoque Idololatriæ crimine immunem esse: nec minori injuriâ scelus illud ei exprobrari, à Cervicosis Calvini Gregalibus, quàm iidem recenter innocentissimis Catholicis, Regique fidelissimis subditis in Angliâ execrandum Majestatis crimen exprobrarunt, sua nobis facinora objicientes; quæ si successissent ex voto, ob eadem Catholicos trucidare constituerant, ut sceleris ab ipsis commissi pænas nos insontes, nihil eâ de re cogitantes lueremus, quæ constant cum ex hominum fide dignissimorum testimonio, tum ex ipsorum Reorum confessione, tum denique ex ipsorum chirographis. Hæc Calviniana Fides!

FINIS.